REPORT RESUMES

ED 002 895   24
HOW STATE LEGISLATORS VIEW THE PROBLEM OF SCHOOL NEEDS.
BY- FERGUSON, LEROY C.
MICHIGAN ST. UNIV., EAST LANSING
REPORT NUMBER CRP-532   PUB DATE   60
CONTRACT OEC-532(8166)
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$3.16   79P.

DESCRIPTORS- *STATE LEGISLATION, *EDUCATIONAL NEEDS, *PUBLIC SCHOOLS, EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS, FACTOR ANALYSIS, *OPINIONS, *ATTITUDES, EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES, EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN, CALIFORNIA, NEW JERSEY, OHIO, TENNESSEE

LEGISLATORS IN FOUR STATES WERE ASKED THEIR OPINIONS ON THE PROBLEMS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED TO IDENTIFY THE FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCE THEIR EDUCATIONAL PERCEPTIONS AND THE SOLUTIONS TO SCHOOL PROBLEMS WHICH THEY PROPOSE. EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF STATE GOVERNMENT INCLUDE ESTABLISHING THE LEGAL STRUCTURE OF THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM, SETTING STANDARDS FOR TEACHER TRAINING, AND PROVIDING FOR PUBLIC EDUCATIONAL FUNDS. THESE ASPECTS AND OTHERS WERE USED TO PREPARE THE PROJECT INTERVIEW FORM FROM WHICH THE VIEWS OF OVER 420 LEGISLATORS WERE OBTAINED. IN ADDITION TO THE INTERVIEW DATA, INFORMATION WAS GATHERED ON THE SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE DISTRICT REPRESENTED BY EACH LEGISLATOR, THE ROLL CALL RECORDS, AND THE EDUCATIONAL BILLS EACH HAD INTRODUCED. THESE DATA WERE THEN CORRELATED WITH THE INDIVIDUAL VARIABLES OF AGE, EDUCATION, OCCUPATION, URBAN-RURAL NATURE OF THE HOME COUNTY, IDEOLOGY, POLITICAL PARTY, LOBBYIST PERCEPTION, AND LEGISLATIVE EXPERIENCE. AMONG THE OVERALL FINDINGS, MOST OF THE LEGISLATORS DISCUSSED EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS IN TERMS OF FINANCE. ABOUT ONE-HALF OF THEM MENTIONED ONLY FINANCE. BUT ABOUT ONE-THIRD SUGGESTED ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS, AND A FEW WERE CONCERNED WITH CURRICULUM. ALL VARIABLES WERE ANALYZED WITH RESPECT TO THE LEGISLATOR'S DEGREE OF INVOLVEMENT WITH THE SCHOOL NEEDS ISSUE. (JH)

332

'4

ED002895

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

HOW STATE LEGISLATORS VIEW THE PROBLEM OF SCHOOL NEEDS

LeRoy Craig Ferguson

HOW STATE LEGISLATORS VIEW THE PROBLEM OF SCHOOL NEEDS

Cooperative Research Project No. 532 (8166)

LeRoy Craig Ferguson
Department of Political Science
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

1960

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Most of the data were originally collected as part of the State Legislative Research Project which was supported by the Social Science Research Council. Fellow participants with the author on this project were William Buchanan, University of Southern California, Heinz Eulau, Stanford University, and John C. Wahlke, Vanderbilt University, but only the author is responsible for the views expressed in this report.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

3414

Many people have given assistance in the preparation of this report, and it will be possible to mention only a few of them here. First of all, I am indebted to my colleagues in the State Legislative Research project, whose names are listed on the title page. The collection and analysis of these data has been a joint project, and I have made frequent use of working papers that they prepared for the larger project.

The State Legislative Research Project was originally given financial support from the Committee on Political Behavior of the Social Research Council, and the analysis which is reported here was supported by the Cooperative Research Branch of the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I am indebted to Professor Wilbur B. Brookover, of the College of Education at Michigan State University, for making the suggestion that the Cooperative Research Branch might be willing to support such a venture.

Two other distinguished members of the College of Education faculty, Professors Ernest O. Melby and Floyd W. Reeves, read a preliminary draft and made numerous valuable suggestions for revision.

Several graduate students and research assistants worked on the project at various times. Douglas E. Inkster and Frank E. Warden, Jr. prepared seminar papers which contributed to an understanding of the attitude data, and invaluable assistance with IBM machine work and preparation of tables was provided by Janette Bigelow and Murray Frost.

Much of the material in Part IV was provided by the interested cooperation of the officials of the Education Associations who were interviewed in each of the four states. These were, in California, Dr. Arthur F. Corey and Robert E. McKay; in New Jersey, Dr. Frederick L. Hipp; in Ohio, Walton B. Bliss and T. G. O'Keefe; and in Tennessee, Frank Bass, Dr. Donald Sahli, and Gavit Cheshire.

Finally, acknowledgment should be made of the patience and willingness of the 422 state legislators in California, New Jersey, Ohio, and Tennessee who gave us their views on the problem of school needs.

LCF
East Lansing, Michigan
November, 1960

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS i

LIST OF TABLES iv

BRIEF SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS 1

INTRODUCTION 3

Part I
SOLUTIONS AND ACTIONS 5

Concern for the Problem 5

Character of Perception of Problem 6

Action in Support of Proposed Solution 15

Part II
SOURCES OF ADVICE AND INFLUENCE 17

Advice and Information Sources Most Trusted 17

Rating of Influentials 22

Part III
PERCEIVED ATTITUDES OF CONSTITUENTS, FELLOW MEMBERS, AND LOBBIES 29

Contacts from Constituents 29

Attitudes of Fellow Members 33

Attitudes of Interest Groups and Lobbies 37

Part IV
LOBBYIST PERCEPTIONS AND ROLL CALL ANALYSIS 44

Lobbyists' Perceptions of Friendly and Unfriendly Legislators 44

Legislative Roll Call Votes on Education Bills 46

Part V
CORRELATES OF ATTITUDE TOWARD EDUCATION 53

Age 53

Education 54

Occupation 55

Urban-Rural Nature of Home County 57

Ideology 58

Party 59

Legislative Experience 60

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

Unrelated Variables.......... 61

SUMMARY.......... 61

FOOTNOTES.......... 67

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Legislative Interviews........ 4
2. Experts in Education........ 5
3. Degree of Concern with School Needs........ 6
4. Character of Perception of School Problem........ 7
5. Experts' Perception of Character of School Problem........ 8
6. Suggested Solution: Source of Finances........ 9
7. Suggested Solution: Allocation of Funds........ 10
8. Suggested Solutions: Administrative and Curriculum........ 11
9. Responses Used to Measure Attitude Toward Education........ 12
10. Attitude Toward Education by State, Expertise, and Degree of Concern........ 14
11. Type of Action on School Needs by State........ 15
12. Type of Action on School Needs by Attitude and Expertise........ 16
13. Sources of Advice on School Needs by State........ 18
14. Sources of Advice on School Needs by Attitude and Expertise........ 19
15. Sources of Advice on School Needs by Representational Role........ 21
16. Rating of Influentials by State........ 23
17. Rating of Influentials by Attitude........ 24
18. Rating of Influentials by Representational Role and Areal Orientation........ 26
19. Rating of Importance of Interest Groups by Group Role Type........ 27
20. Rating of Importance of Advice of Party Leaders by Party Orientation Type.. 28
21. Number of Contacts from Constituents on Problem of School Needs by State and Attitude........ 30
22. Kind of Constituents who Contacted Respondent by State and Attitude........ 32
23. Percentage of Constituents Agreeing with Legislator on Problem of School Needs........ 33
24. Party Members' Attitudes on Problem of School Needs........ 34
25. Urban-Rural Members' Attitudes on Problem of School Needs........ 34
26. Opinion Conflicts Ranked First or Second on School Needs by State and Attitude........ 36

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table Page

27. General Salience of Different Classes of Interest Groups.................. 38

28. Salience of Different Classes of Interests in Four Different Contexts...... 38

29. Relative Salience of Specific Interest Groups in Various Contexts.......... 40

30. Group Interests Agreeing and Disagreeing on Issue of School Needs.......... 43

31. Group Interests Agreeing or Disagreeing with Legislators Who Had Favorable Attitudes Toward Education by State.. 44

32. Educational Lobbyists' Perceptions of Friendly and Unfriendly Legislators.. 46

33. Relation of Educational Attitudes to California Assembly Roll Call Votes... 47

34. Relation of Educational Attitudes to New Jersey Assembly Roll Call Votes... 50

35. Relation of Education Attitudes to Ohio House Roll Call Votes.............. 51

36. Relation of Educational Attitudes to Tennessee Legislature Roll Call Votes. 52

37. Relation of Age to Legislators' Attitude Toward Education.................. 54

38. Relation of Amount of Education to Legislators' Attitude Toward Education.. 55

39. Relation of Occupation to Legislators' Attitude Toward Education........... 56

40. Relation of Place of Residence to Attitude Toward Education................ 57

41. Relation of Ideology to Legislators' Attitude Toward Education............. 58

42. Relation of Party to Legislators' Attitude Toward Education................ 59

43. Relation of Legislative Experience to Legislators' Attitude Toward Education.. 60

BRIEF SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

For the benefit of the reader who may not be able to examine the entire report, a few of the major findings are listed here. There is a more comprehensive summary at the end of the report, but neither summary includes the qualifying and explanatory details that should be used in interpreting the findings.

During the 1957 sessions of the legislatures of California, New Jersey, Ohio, and Tennessee, 422 legislators in those states were asked to give their views on the problem of school needs. Most of the legislators discussed the problem primarily in terms of finance. About one-half of them mentioned only finances, but about one-third suggested administrative problems, and a few were concerned with curriculum. California legislators were more likely than those in the other three states to discuss the problem exclusively in financial terms, and Ohio lawmakers were more likely to be concerned with administration.

In their discussion of school finances, New Jersey lawmakers were more likely than those in the other states to propose new taxes, and Californians were more likely to mention state aid. Tennessee legislators were less likely than those in the other states to propose new taxes, but they were second only to California in the likelihood of suggesting more state aid.

More than one-fourth of the legislators interviewed advocated higher teacher salaries, and Tennesseeans were much more likely than those in the other states to suggest this need. Ohio lawmakers were more likely than those in the other states to mention a need for administrative economy.

On the basis of his discussion of the school needs problem, each of the legislators was classified as favorable, ambivalent, unfavorable, or neutral, in his general attitude toward education. Of the total group of lawmakers, almost one-half gave replies that were entirely favorable to education, but Ohio legislators were much less likely than those in the other three states to take an entirely favorable position.

When the legislators were asked where they got their most reliable information on the school needs matter, the sources of trusted advice that were most frequently mentioned were educational officials and the education associations. Ohioans were more likely than those in the other states to mention educational officials, while in New Jersey the Education Association was more likely to be mentioned. Legislators who said that they got their most reliable information from education associations or state educational officials were more likely to be favorable in their attitude toward education than those who looked for advice to local educational officials.

New Jersey and Tennessee legislators reported many more contacts from constituents on the matter of school needs, than the legislators in the other two states, and Ohio had the largest proportion of members (over one-third) who said that they had had no contacts whatsoever from constituents on the school needs matter. Legislators who were favorable to education were likely to report more contacts from constituents than those in the other attitude categories, and legislators who were unfavorable to education were much more likely to report that they had no contacts at all from their constituents on the matter of school needs.

Two-thirds of the Tennessee lawmakers, and more than one-half of those in New Jersey reported contacts from teachers or teacher organizations, but there was a smaller proportion of teacher contacts in California, and in Ohio only one-fifth of the legislators said that they had heard from teachers. Legislators who were favorable to education were considerably more likely than those in the other attitude categories to report that they had been contacted by teachers or parents.

The legislators rated educational interests as among the most powerful lobbies in all four of the states, but when they were asked which groups or lobbies were particularly worth listening to, regardless of their power, the educational groups fared rather poorly, particularly in comparison with business interests.

Legislators generally favorable to education were likely to perceive themselves as in agreement with educational interests and in disagreement with business interests, while the reverse held true for legislators who were classified as unfavorable to education.

what else?

In an analysis of roll call votes on educational bills during the 1957 sessions, it was possible to show some relation between legislators' general attitude toward education and the likelihood that they would vote in support of the position of the state education association.

Some attempt was made to determine some of the independent variables that might be related to attitude toward education. This showed that older members of the legislature were more likely to be favorable to education in Ohio and Tennessee, but that in New Jersey the younger legislators were more likely to be favorable. Legislators who had less education themselves were more likely to be favorable in attitude toward education than those who were college graduates. Lawyers were less likely than other occupational groups to be favorable toward education in Ohio and Tennessee, but the New Jersey lawyer-legislators were more likely to have a favorable attitude. There was wide variation in the educational attitudes of various business occupations represented in the four legislatures.

Legislators who lived in metropolitan areas were less likely to be favorable than those who lived in other areas of the four states, and in Tennessee the legislators from the most rural areas were much more likely to take a favorable position. In Ohio, however, the members who lived in the most rural areas were more likely to be unfavorable to education.

Legislators who were generally "liberal" in their political views were more likely to be favorable to education than those who were generally "conservative". Democrats were more likely than Republicans to take a favorable position on the school needs issue in California, Ohio, and New Jersey, but in Tennessee the reverse held true. "Regular" Democrats were more likely to be favorable than Democrats with a "Weak" party orientation, but in the Republican Party the "Regulars" were more likely to be unfavorable.

Members with longer experience in the legislature were more likely to be favorable than those who had had less experience. Attitude toward education was found not to be related to income, religion, previous governmental experience, or place of upbringing.

INTRODUCTION

Within recent years, as the quality of American education has come to be recognized as a potentially major factor in international politics, increasing attention has been called to the need for study of how educational policies are developed, and who controls the American public school system. As one recent writer has emphasized, American public schools are part of government, educational policies are largely based on governmental decisions, and the determination of what these decisions are, how they are made, and who makes them, forms an important sector of American politics. Until quite recently, however, neither educators nor political scientists have given much attention to the "politics" of American education.[1]

As a result of what has been described as a tacitly agreed upon "taboo" educators have shied away from study of political processes relevant to educational policy, and political scientists have tended to ignore the politics of public education even though this governmental activity ranks second only to national defense in terms of both extent and public expenditure.[2]

Quite recently there have been a number of studies of politics in local school districts, but little has been done on educational aspects of state politics in spite of the fact that education is one of the most important functions of the state governments which are responsible, among other things, for establishing the legal structure of the educational system, setting standards for teacher training, and provision of an increasing proportion of the funds for public education.[3]

The need for such research was well-stated recently by Professor Thomas H. Eliot in expressing the view

> that state action, especially in the legislatures, is now significant and will soon have a crucial impact on educational development, and that useful findings can result from a comparative study of state influence, management or control.[4]

It would be nice to be able to report that the study reported here was undertaken in order to fulfill the need described by Professor Eliot. The fact is, however, that those of us who carried out this study were just as guilty as most of our fellow political scientists of unconsciously observing the "taboo" on the study of educational politics. None of us had any particular interest in educational research, and the fact that we gathered data on the subject of school needs was to a considerable extent fortuitous. This came about somewhat as follows.

In the fall of 1955 we received a grant from the Political Behavior Committee of the Social Science Research Council to carry out a study of Some Critical Roles of American State Legislators.[5] The research design for this study called for an interview schedule which would elicit data from legislators as to the roles which they assumed with reference to political parties, pressure groups, their constituencies, and their fellow-members.

As a supplement to these data on legislative roles, we wanted to get information on each legislator's attitude on some major issue that was facing the legislature. We hoped that this might demonstrate whether there was any relation between the roles assumed by the legislator and his decision-making behavior with regard to a specific issue. At one stage we planned to let the legislator himself choose the particular issue to be discussed by asking him what he considered to be the most important issue facing the then current session of his legislature. However, when pre-testing indicated that the data produced from such a procedure would make comparative analysis difficult, we decided to try to select one specific issue that would be likely to be salient in all four of the legislatures that we planned to study. This eventually led us to the choice of the issue of school needs for inclusion in the interview schedule.

For our purposes this choice was not entirely a happy one, for, while the school needs issue was undoubtedly salient for all of the legislators, a great many of them regarded the school problem as one which was quite different from other political issues. In retrospect, we think that the choice of some other issue might have yielded more meaningful data on the relation of roles to decision-making behavior.

It appeared to the writer, however, that the data obtained from the series of questions on school needs were worthy of separate analysis, and he made such a proposal to the Cooperative Research Branch of the United States Office of Education. The funds provided on the basis of this proposal enabled not only analysis of the data already assembled in the larger project, but also the collection of additional material on the specific school problems facing the four legislatures in the 1957 sessions, in interviews with educational lobbyists in each of the four states.

In broad outline, the report has been presented in five major sections. In Part I we have presented the solutions to the school needs problem that were proposed by the legislators interviewed, and their accounts of the actions they had taken in support of their solutions. In Part II we have tried to give an indication of how the legislators arrived at the solutions that they proposed. This includes the sources of advice and information that they trusted most on school needs matters, as well as their rating of the importance various factors which might have influenced their thinking on the problem. Part III presents the legislators' perceptions of the attitude toward school needs of various groups or interests in their constituencies, in the legislature, and in the state generally. In Part IV we have presented the views of educational lobbyists both as to which legislators were regarded as friendly or unfriendly toward education, and as to which were the most important educational roll calls in the 1957 sessions. Part IV also includes a limited amount of roll call analysis which shows the relation of attitudes expressed in the interviews to voting records on educational bills. A measure of each individual legislator's general attitude toward education was used as an interpretive variable throughout the report, and in Part V we have presented some additional correlates of this measure.

Table 1

LEGISLATIVE INTERVIEWS

	California	New Jersey	Ohio	Tennessee	Total
Total number in legislature	120	79	173	132	504
Total number interviewed	113 (94%)	79 (100%)	162 (94%)	120 (91%)	474 (94%)
Total number interviewed on issue of school needs	82 (68%)	71 (90%)	155 (90%)	114 (86%)	422 (84%)

The original plan of the State Legislative Research Project was to interview all of the members of the state legislatures of California, New Jersey, Ohio, and Tennessee, but in every state except New Jersey there were a few who either refused to be interviewed, or with whom we were unable to arrange an appointment. As Table 1 shows, however, interviews were conducted with a total of 474 legislators. This constituted 94% of the total membership.

Before the interviewing began it was agreed that if the interviewer was pressed for time, the series of questions on school needs would be eliminated. As a result of this the total "N" for the school needs questions was 422, which was 84% of the total membership. It will be noted in Table 1 that, because of special interviewing problems in that state, a somewhat smaller proportion of California legislators were asked the education questions than was the case in the other three states.[6]

At one point in the interview schedule each legislator was asked whether there were any particular subjects or fields of legislation in which he considered himself particularly expert.[7] About 20% of the legislators interviewed said that they were experts in the field of education, but as Table 2 indicates the proportion of self-named educational experts was somewhat smaller in Tennessee than in the other three states. The legislators were also asked to name five or six other members of their respective chambers whom they considered experts in particular fields, and as Table 2 shows there were a total of 26 legislators who were named as educational experts by five per cent or more of the members of their respective chambers. In a number of the succeeding tables it will be noted that the educational experts differed from other members in their attitudes toward education.

Table 2

EXPERTS IN EDUCATION

	California	New Jersey	Ohio	Tennessee	Total
Named self as expert in education	25	16	37	16	94
Named as expert in education by 5% or more of chamber	7	5	8	6	26
Named as expert in education by both self and 5% or more of chamber	7	3	7	4	21

Part I

SOLUTIONS AND ACTIONS

Concern for the Problem

The introductory question in the education series (Table 3) was intended to produce a raw measure of the legislator's degree of affect or involvement with the school needs issue. The replies did not give us a very satisfactory measure for discriminating among the respondents, since more than three-fourths of them indicated that the matter of school needs was of "great concern" to them personally. We did, however, get some verification for our original assumption that this problem would be regarded as of major importance in each of the states in the study.

Table 3

DEGREE OF CONCERN WITH SCHOOL NEEDS

Q. 30. "Now I'd like to ask you some questions about the work of this session of the legislature. The issue of school needs is one almost every legislative session faces. Would you say that this particular matter is of great concern to you personally, of some concern, of little concern, or of no concern?"

	Great concern	Some concern	Little concern	No concern	Don't know, can't say	Total
State						
California N=82	86%	11	3	---	---	100%
New Jersey N=64	75%	22	3	---	---	100%
Ohio N=154	73%	21	3	2	1	100%
Tennessee N=114	80%	17	1	---	2	100%
Total N=414	78%	18	2	1	1	100%
Educational Experts						
Self named educational experts N=81	89%	8	1	1	1	100%
Educational experts named by 5% of chamber N=21	90%	---	5	---	5	100%
Other legislators N=333	75%	21	2	1	1	100%

Although the great majority of the legislators in every state showed "great concern" for education, Table 3 shows that there were some interstate differences in the degree of concern expressed, and that California legislators were considerably more likely than those in Ohio to express "great concern". We shall see later that the legislators in these two states were also considerably different in their other attitudes toward educational problems. Table 3 also shows that the educational experts were more likely than other members to indicate that they felt "great concern" with regard to the school needs issue.

Character of Perception of Problem

The next question in the education series was a wide open one where the legislators were asked to describe their own personal solutions for the general problem of school needs. In Table 4 we have presented a broad delineation of the ways in which they perceived the character of the problem. Since we knew that educational budgets were a major concern of all four of the state legislatures, we were not surprised to find that most of the legislators viewed the problem primarily in terms of finance. More than one-half of them mentioned only finances in explaining their personal solutions to the problem, but about one-third suggested administrative solutions, and a few (10%) were concerned with curriculum problems.

Included under the general category "financial" in Table 4 were all mentions of both sources (taxes, state and federal aid), and allocation of funds (teacher salaries, school construction), as well as general discussion of budgetary economy or expansion.

Under the category "administrative" were included solutions dealing with consolidation or reorganization, standardization of construction, teacher training, use of facilities, and control of educational programs. Most of those in the category "curriculum" advocated either retrenchment (more 3 R's; teach only fundamentals; less auto-driver training), or expansion (broaden curriculum, vocational guidance, special education). Proposals for consolidation, reorganization, expansion or retrenchment, were, of course, frequently discussed in terms of finance, in which case they were coded in both categories.

There were, of course, a few legislators who were unable to analyze the school problem, or who discussed the school problem but suggested no solution. There were also widely scattered, more or less exotic or esoteric solutions suggested, one of the more intriguing being that of the legislator who advocated "some type of birth control to cut down on the number of pupils". Another legislator proposed as a solution, the abolition of the State Education Association and the State Board of Education.

Table 4

CHARACTER OF PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL PROBLEM

Q. 31. "Can you tell me what solution you would personally favor for this general problem?" (Or, if matter settled: "Can you tell me what solution you would personally have favored for this general problem?")

	California N=79	New Jersey N=71	Ohio N=155	Tennessee N=113	Total N=418
Financial problem	94%*	85%	74%	82%	82%
Administrative problem	14	34	41	29	32
Curriculum problem	5	8	12	12	10
Other perception of school problem	1	8	6	4	5
Unable to analyze school problem	3	3	8	7	6

*Totals are more than 100% since some legislators characterized the problem in more than one way. The proportion of those interviewed who mentioned only a financial problem were: California, 84%; New Jersey, 51%; Ohio, 42%; and Tennessee, 55%; for all states combined, 55%.

While the most important thing to be noticed in Table 4 is the large proportion of legislators in all four states who were concerned with school finance, there were some important differences among the states in the manner in which legislators characterized the school needs problem. California legislators were more likely to mention finances than those in other states, and they (Californians) were also less likely than legislators in the other states to discuss the school problem in administrative terms.[8] On the other hand a relatively large proportion of Ohio legislators mentioned administrative problems. One possible explanation for the fact that the Ohio legislators were somewhat more likely to mention administrative solutions and somewhat less likely to mention financial solutions was the fact that just prior to the 1957 session of the legislature a new program of state aid had gone into effect in that state.

Table 5

EXPERTS' PERCEPTION OF CHARACTER OF SCHOOL PROBLEM

	Self named educational experts (N=79)	Educational experts named by 5% of the chamber (N=20)	Other legislators (N=339)
Financial problem	91%	95%	80%
Administrative problem	38	40	30
Curriculum problem	18	15	8
Other perception of school problem	3	---	6
Unable to analyze school problem	---	---	7
Characterized problem in more than one way	42	45	26

The educational experts in the legislatures were similar to other members in the pattern of their perception of the school needs problem, in that they were primarily concerned with financial solutions. It can be seen in Table 5, however, that the experts were much more likely than other members to give a broad characterization to the problem. That is, the experts were likely to mention both financial and administrative, or financial and curriculum solutions, or a combination of all three.

Table 6 presents a more detailed picture of the various sources of school finance that were mentioned by the legislators who discussed the educational problem in those terms. In every state except Tennessee there were more who advocated new taxes (or tax increases) than there were who said that they opposed new taxes.

The state of New Jersey was the only one of the four states in the study that had neither a sales tax nor an income tax (California had both), and this probably helps explain why a considerably higher proportion of New Jersey legislators were willing to propose new taxes than in any of the other states.

State aid was much more likely to be mentioned in California than in the other states. This was apparently related to the fact that there was a surplus source of money available at the time the interviews were being conducted. The Revenue Deficiency Fund ("rainy day fund") was the last of the money put aside for postwar contingencies by Governor Earl Warren during the war years when the state regularly had surplusses.

Even though the Tennessee legislators were less likely than those in any other state to suggest new taxes, they were second only to California in the likelihood of suggesting state aid as a source of school finance.

Out of the total group of legislators interviewed only nine per cent mentioned federal aid to education, and these were about equally divided for and against such action. A few said that they favored federal aid for school construction, but not for general operating purposes.

The California legislature had the smallest proportion of those who advocated less state aid or more local financial effort. This appears to be consistent with the California emphasis on state aid as a source of educational finance.

Among the other possible sources of income for schools mentioned by the legislators were state lotteries, racing, and other forms of legalized gambling. A few Tennesseans also favored state-owned liquor stores with the profits going for education.

The legislators' suggestions for the allocation of educational funds are shown in Table 7. More than one-fourth of the lawmakers advocated providing more money for teachers' salaries and 14% of them mentioned the need for more money for school construction.

Table 6

SUGGESTED SOLUTION: SOURCE OF FINANCES

	California N=79	New Jersey N=71	Ohio N=155	Tennessee N=113	Total N=418
New taxes	13%	37%	18%	6%	17%
No new taxes	11	4	6	8	7
State aid (general reserve fund, surplus sources, etc.)	62	21	11	26	26
Federal aid	1	7	3	4	4
No federal aid	3	11	5	4	5
More local financial effort; local districts should help themselves, less state aid	6	14	16	18	14
Other sources	1	13	1	13	6

The data suggest that Ohioans were less likely than those in other states to want more money allocated to either salaries or construction. The most striking interstate difference shown in Table 7, however, is the much higher proportion of Tennessee legislators who advocated more money for teachers' salaries. This is understandable in view of the fact that teacher salary scales are considerably lower in Tennessee than in the other three states, but it is not very consistent with the previous indication (Table 6) that very few Tennessee legislators proposed new taxes.

A few legislators in both New Jersey and Ohio suggested allocation of more money for student scholarships, and among the other allocation suggestions made in the various states were funds for parochial schools, paying teachers for summer work, and increased retirement benefits.

Table 7

SUGGESTED SOLUTION: ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

	California N=79	New Jersey N=71	Ohio N=155	Tennessee N=113	Total N=418
More money for construction, capital outlays	18%	18%	10%	15%	14%
More money for teachers' salaries	18	23	14	51	26
More money for student scholarships	---	5	5	---	3

As has already been noted above (Table 4) relatively few of the legislators mentioned administrative or curriculum solutions to the school needs problem, however, those who did characterize the problem in this way covered a rather wide range of suggested solutions, most of which are shown in Table 8. The most frequently mentioned solution in this general area was administrative economy. Included in this category were such suggestions as "keep expenses in line with revenue", "cut out frills", use of larger classes, and elimination of free textbooks. Ohio legislators were more likely than those in other states to mention the administrative economy category, and they also were more likely to mention the desirability of school district consolidation.

A need for standardization and economy in school construction received some attention, particularly in New Jersey, and there were also suggestions for more efficient use of existing facilities, such as more hours of classes per day and summer sessions. A few of the legislators thought that colleges were doing an inadequate job of training teachers, and there were some feelings that tenure systems made it difficult to reward good teachers and get rid of unsatisfactory ones. In this general area of personnel there were also suggestions for the elimination of "unnecessary" supervisors.

Five per cent of the law-makers interviewed emphasized that they wanted to maintain local control of the schools, and a similar number gave some attention to curriculum expansion or retrenchment. Among the suggestions for retrenchment were "more 3 R's", "teach only fundamentals", and "less auto driver training". Those who wanted to broaden the curriculum mentioned such things as student counseling, vocational guidance, and various types of special education.

In both New Jersey and Ohio there were a few legislators who spoke of the need for developing the state institutions of higher learning. The need for further study of the problem of school needs was mentioned in every state, but Californians were considerably more likely than other legislators to say that a solution depended on such study.

Table 8

SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS: ADMINISTRATIVE AND CURRICULUM

	California N=79	New Jersey N=71	Ohio N=155	Tennessee N=113	Total N=418
Administrative economy; cut out frills, no free texts, etc.	6%	10%	23%	4%	13%
Consolidation of school districts	4	---	17	3	8
Standardization of construction	1	14	3	---	4
More efficient use of existing facilities	---	4	5	6	4
Better teacher training	1	1	2	8	3
Relaxing of certification and tenure requirements for teachers	3	---	---	7	2
Streamline personnel, cut out unnecessary supervisors	---	1	6	---	2
Maintain local control	4	10	3	5	5
Curriculum retrenchment	1	3	3	5	3
Curriculum expansion	1	3	2	2	2
Develop and expand colleges and universities	---	6	7	1	4
Solution depends on further study	20	1	4	6	7

Tables 4 through 8 have shown the substance of the various suggestions made by the legislators for solving the problem of school needs, classified according to subject matter covered in the replies to question 31 in the interview schedule. These same data are shown in Table 9 classified according to the general attitude toward education demonstrated in the legislators' replies to the question.

Since most of the subsequent questions in the interview schedule were stated in the context of the legislators' personal perceptions of a solution to the problem, we thought that a general measure of each legislator's attitude toward education would make the analysis of these other questions more meaningful.

Accordingly, the replies to question 31 were classified into three groups: (1) those favorable to education; (2) those unfavorable; and (3) those not indicating an attitudinal dimension. Classified as favorable were all references to the need for more taxes, state or federal aid, more money for construction and salaries, consolidation of school districts, and curriculum expansion. Among the replies classified as unfavorable were those opposing new taxes and state or federal aid, as well as proposals for administrative economy and curriculum retrenchment. A complete listing of the replies used in this classification is shown in Table 9.

Table 9

RESPONSES USED TO MEASURE ATTITUDE TOWARD EDUCATION

Favorable	Per cent giving response	Unfavorable	Per cent giving response
New taxes: sales tax; industrial property tax; real estate tax; severance tax; bond issue; etc.	17%	No new taxes	7%
State aid from surplus source: general revenue fund; rainy-day fund	11	No further state aid, less state aid	2
State aid (particular source not specified)	15	No federal aid	5
Federal aid	4	More local financial effort; state aid only if local districts help themselves	6
More money for construction, capital outlays	14	Local districts should help themselves	6
More money for teachers' salaries	26	More efficient use of existing facilities: summer sessions; more hours per day; etc.	4
More money for student scholarships	3	Streamlining top personnel: appointive boards; cut-out unnecessary supervisory personnel; etc.	2
Consolidation of school districts: for greater efficiency; wider tax base; etc.	8	More economy: administrative economy; equitable distribution of available funds; keep expenses in line with revenue; cut out frills; cut down huge school districts; no free texts; larger classes; etc.	13
Better teaching training	3	Relaxation of certification and tenure requirements for teachers	2
Curriculum expansion (broaden curriculum; vocational guidance; slow-learner groups; special training for crippled children; etc.)	2	Curriculum: retrenchment (more 3 R's; less auto driver training; teach only fundamentals)	3
Colleges: develop and expand state university system	2		
Colleges: develop and expand junior or community colleges	2		

Using this classification the legislators were then separated into four groups: (1) those who made only favorable remarks in reply to question 31; (2) those who made both favorable and unfavorable remarks (ambivalents); (3) those who made only unfavorable remarks; and (4) those whose remarks had no attitudinal dimension (neutrals).

This is, of course, a rather crude measure of legislative attitudes toward education, which is limited by the open-ended nature of the question. The obvious fact that the legislators varied considerably in both articulateness and information on educational problems may have affected the classification. For example, the legislators who gave lengthy replies to the question were probably more likely to fall into the ambivalent category, and those who were less verbose may have been more likely to be classified as neutrals.

Similarly, since most of the legislators answered the open-ended question in terms of finance, most of the responses shown in Table 9, particularly those most frequently mentioned, refer to either sources or allocation of funds. In interpreting the use of this attitude measure in subsequent tables the reader should bear in mind that, for the most part, legislators classified as "favorable" to education were those who wanted to spend more money on schools, while those classified as "unfavorable" were, for the most part, advocates on economy.

It is possible that some educators or legislators might disagree with our subjective judgement as to which replies were "favorable" and which "unfavorable" to education. Several dimensions have been combined, and several not completely compatible objectives have been lumped together. Bearing in mind these limitations, we still think it reasonable to at least dichotomize between those legislators who advocated expansion, (more money for teacher salaries, school construction, colleges, specialized programs, etc.) and those who were for the status quo, (economy, no new taxes, and retrenchment--including those who, justifiably or not, insisted on more efficiency and self-help). We feel that the general measure of attitude toward education based on such a dichotomy provided a useful variable which helped us to interpret replies to other questions in the interview schedule.

It might have been preferable to have used a set of scale items or some other type of "forced answer" question to measure the legislators' general attitude toward education, but, as has been indicated before, at the time the questionnaire was designed we did not anticipate the use of the educational material in the manner that it is presented in this report.

The distribution of the legislators according to this measure of general attitude toward education is shown in Table 10. Of the entire group of legislators who were asked to give their personal solution to the problem of school needs, almost one-half gave replies that were entirely favorable to education, and the remainder were divided into three groups (ambivalent, unfavorable, and neutral) of approximately equal size. This distribution is consistent with the general impression from the interviewing experience that most state legislators have a favorable attitude toward education. We note in Table 10, however, that there were rather marked attitudinal differences among the four states in the study.

Less than one-third of the Ohio legislators expressed only favorable attitudes toward education, and they differed markedly in this regard from the legislators in each of the other three states. In California, on the other hand, almost two-thirds of those interviewed made only favorable remarks, considerably more than in any of the other three states.

In the unfavorable category, Ohio had a considerably higher proportion than either California or New Jersey, and there was also an important difference in this regard between these two states and Tennessee.

Table 10

ATTITUDE TOWARD EDUCATION
BY STATE, EXPERTISE, AND DEGREE OF CONCERN

	Attitude Toward Education				
	Favorable	Ambivalent	Unfavorable	Neutral	Total
State					
California N=79	66%	11	13	10	100%
New Jersey N=71	54%	21	8	17	100%
Ohio N=155	30%	21	24	25	100%
Tennessee N=113	44%	20	21	15	100%
Total N=418	44%	19	19	18	100%
Experts					
Self named educational experts N=79	51%	25	13	11	100%
Educational experts named by 5% of chamber N=20	50%	25	15	10	100%
Other legislators N=339	43%	17	20	20	100%
Degree of Concern For School Needs					
Great concern N=324	48%	19	17	16	100%
Some concern N=74	32%	22	23	23	100%

Some of the reasons for and possible implications of these interstate differences will be presented in the analysis that follows. We would be led to believe from these data that there might be some similarity between New Jersey and California in their approach to educational problems, and that these two states would differ considerably in this regard from both Ohio and Tennessee. We might also expect that in some cases there might be differences between Tennessee and Ohio. Table 10 also shows the relation of attitude toward education to degree of concern for the problem of school needs expressed in reply to question 30 (Table 3). Those legislators who said that they had "great" concern for the problem were considerably more likely to be favorable, and less likely to be unfavorable or neutral than those who indicated only "some" concern for the issue.

There were also differences in attitude toward education between the legislative educational experts and other members. It can be seen in Table 10 that the experts were more likely than other legislators to be favorable or ambivalent, and less likely to be unfavorable or neutral.

Action in Support of Proposed Solution

After the legislators had described their solutions to the school needs problem, they were asked what they had done, or expected to do to promote the solution that they favored. The types of action most frequently mentioned are shown in Table 11. More than 70% of those interviewed reported at least one action, over one-half of them mentioned more than one action, and one-third mentioned three or more.

It can be seen in Table 11 that the Tennessee legislators were considerably more likely than those in New Jersey and Ohio to report at least some activity. This appears to be a reflection of the fact that the major battle during the 1957 legislative session in Tennessee concerned the General Education Bill, and centered almost entirely on the issue of teacher salary increases.

The relatively large proportion (38%) of Ohio legislators who reported no action may possibly be due to the larger size of that legislature, and it may also have been related to the fact that there were no major educational matters before the 1957 session of that legislature. The fact that over one-third of the New Jersey members also reported no individual activity is probably a reflection of the power of the majority caucuses which controlled all activity in the New Jersey Legislature and left relatively little room for meaningful activity on the part of individual members.

Table 11

TYPE OF ACTION ON SCHOOL NEEDS BY STATE

Q. 32a. "Just what have you done, or what do you still expect to do, to promote the solution you favor in this school needs matter?"

	California N=79	New Jersey N=66	Ohio N=154	Tennessee N=113	Total N=412
No action	23%	35%	38%	16%	29%
Author/sponsor particular bill	15	35	25	20	26
Work for solution in committee	46	14	42	30	35
Speak for solution on floor	39	12	30	31	35
Offer amendments favoring solution	13	---	18	26	16
Try to convince other members in private	61	26	45	73	53
Seek support for solution outside legislature	39	35	32	48	39
More than one action	60	36	50	65	54

Table 12

TYPE OF ACTION ON SCHOOL NEEDS BY ATTITUDE AND EXPERTISE

Q. 32a. "Just what have you done, or what do you still expect to do, to promote the solution you favor in this school needs matter?"

	Attitude Toward Education				Experts		
	Favorable N=185	Ambivalent N=77	Unfavorable N=76	Neutral N=68	Self-named educational experts N=78	Educational experts named by 5% of chamber N=21	Other legislators N=334
No action	21%	23%	32%	51%	12%	5%	33%
Author/sponsor particular bill	28	23	17	19	46	48	18
Work for solution in committee	39	42	32	16	68	62	27
Speak for solution on floor	36	31	24	18	49	67	25
Offer amendments favoring solution	16	19	18	9	24	14	14
Try to convince other members in private	58	57	55	32	73	76	48
Seek support for solution outside legislature	44	43	42	21	46	38	37
More than one action	60	57	55	32	83	81	47

With regard to the specific activities reported, the New Jersey legislators were considerably more likely than California and Tennessee members, and somewhat more likely than Ohioans, to say that they had authored or sponsored a particular bill. The proportions in each legislature who reported that they had worked for their solutions in committee gave an accurate reflection of the relative importance of the committee systems in the four legislatures. California and Ohio legislators were much more likely than those in Tennessee and New Jersey to report committee activity, and there was also considerable difference in this regard between the latter two states, with New Jersey members reporting the least amount of committee activity.

The previously mentioned power of the majority caucus in New Jersey also appears to be reflected in the fact that legislators there were less likely than those in other states to report that they had spoken for their solution on the floor or offered amendments. New Jersey legislators were much less likely than those in the other three states to say that they had tried to convince other members in private, and in this regard there was also considerable difference among the other three states with the largest amount of "private convincing" reported in Tennessee. The importance of the education issue in the 1957 session is further indicated by the fact that Tennesseeans were also more likely than those in the other states to report that they had worked for their solutions outside the legislature.

The relation of attitude toward education to activities reported is shown in Table 12. We are not surprised to note in this table that those legislators who were neutral in attitude toward education were much less likely than those in other attitudinal categories to report any activity in support of their solutions. There was little difference in the pattern of activities reported by those in the favorable and ambivalent categories, but both of these categories were likely to report more activity than those who were classified as unfavorable to education. As might have been expected, Table 12 also shows that the educational experts reported much more activity than other members, and the leadership position of the experts named by other members is demonstrated by the fact that over two-thirds of this category reported that they had spoken for their solution on the floor.

Part II

SOURCES OF ADVICE AND INFLUENCE

Advice and Information Sources Most Trusted

After they had given an account of their activities on educational matters the legislators were asked where they got their most reliable information on the subject of school needs--what source of advice they trusted the most. The sources most frequently mentioned are shown in Table 13. State and local school officials and educational associations were the sources of advice most frequently mentioned in all four of the states, but there were some important differences among the four states in proportions of legislators who mentioned the various sources. Ohio legislators were much more likely than those in New Jersey and Tennessee, and somewhat more likely than those in California, to say that they got their most reliable information from local school officials. Ohioans were also somewhat more likely than those in the other three states to mention state school agencies or officials as a reliable source of information and advice.

Educational associations were mentioned as a trusted source by about one-third of those interviewed in California, Ohio, and Tennessee, and in New Jersey a majority of the respondents said that they got their most reliable information from the New Jersey Education Association.

Table 13

SOURCES OF ADVICE ON SCHOOL NEEDS BY STATE

Q. 33. "On this particular subject of school needs, where would you get your most reliable information -- what source of advice and information would you trust the most?"

	California N=73	New Jersey N=70	Ohio N=150	Tennessee N=110	Total N=403
Local school officials	39%	29%	51%	25%	38%
State or local Educational associations	34	51	34	30	36
State school agencies or officials	27	24	34	28	29
Own personal experience or research; experience of friends or relatives, etc.	10	27	11	22	17
Teachers, educators	18	10	11	17	14
Fellow members, committee members, study commissions of legislature	12	3	28	3	14
Other state agencies or officials	15	4	5	27	13
Legislative service agencies: Reference Service, State Library, etc.	10	3	23	6	12
Other interest groups	18	19	9	7	12
Other local government agencies or officials	4	3	4	5	4
Other sources	10	17	2	19	11
More than one source	60	57	67	56	61

Some of the legislators indicated that they had personal experience in the field of education, or that they had benefited from the experience of friends or relatives. This particular source was somewhat more likely to be mentioned in New Jersey and Tennessee than in the other two states.

The advice of fellow members of the legislature was more likely to be mentioned in Ohio than in the other three states, and Ohioans were also more likely to mention legislative service agencies as a trusted source. State agencies or officials other than those directly connected with education were more likely to be mentioned in Tennessee than in the other states, with most of the Tennessee replies in this category having reference to state budget and fiscal officers whom the legislators trusted for advice on matters of educational expenditure.

Table 14

SOURCES OF ADVICE ON SCHOOL NEEDS BY ATTITUDE AND EXPERTISE

Q. 33. "On this particular subject of school needs, where would you get your most reliable information -- what source of advice and information would you trust the most?"

	Attitude Toward Education				Experts		
	Favorable N=181	Ambivalent N=77	Unfavorable N=74	Neutral N=66	Self-named educational experts N=76	Educational experts named by 5% of chamber N=21	Other legislators N=327
Local school officials	36%	44%	34%	42%	33%	14%	40%
State or local Educational associations	45	31	28	29	37	43	36
State or school agencies or officials	36	35	15	21	45	62	26
Own personal experience or research; experience of friends or relatives, etc.	17	18	19	12	18	19	16
Teachers, educators	13	18	15	12	13	14	14
Fellow members, committee members, study commissions of legislature	9	13	18	24	16	10	13
Other state agencies or officials	15	14	8	11	12	19	13
Legislative service agencies: Reference Service, State Library, etc.	11	12	15	15	16	5	12
Other interest groups	17	5	12	5	9	10	12
Other local government agencies or officials	3	1	9	5	5	---	4
Other sources	11	16	8	9	11	14	11
More than one source	66	62	55	58	67	67	60

The data suggest that interest groups other than the education associations were somewhat more important as sources of advice in California and New Jersey than in the other two states. The specific groups most frequently mentioned in this category were the school board associations.

Since we knew that there were important differences among the states in sources of advice most trusted and also in attitude toward education, we would expect to find that, as is shown in Table 14, there would be differences in the sources of advice most trusted by the various attitudinal categories. Legislators who were classified as favorable to education were considerably more likely than those in the other three categories to mention educational associations as a reliable source of advice, and it will be noted that legislators who were unfavorable to education were less likely than other members to say that they relied on the advice of state school agencies or officials.

Looking at these data in another way, we can see that the source of advice most frequently mentioned by legislators favorable to education was the state or local education associations, while the most frequently mentioned source by those who were unfavorable was local school officials. While it is not readily apparent from the way the percentages are run in Table 14, it appeared that legislators who relied on local officials for advice were less likely to be favorable in attitude than those who said that they got their most reliable information from state school officials or the education associations.

It can also be seen in Table 14 that legislators who were neutral toward education were more likely than those in the favorable category to rely on the advice of fellow members.

We note in Table 14 that the educational experts relied on different sources of advice than other members, and it is also apparent that the self-named educational experts differed in somewhat this regard from the experts who were named by other members. The latter were more likely than either the self-named experts or other members to mention the educational associations and much less likely to mention local school officials. Both categories of experts were much more likely than other legislators to say that they looked for reliable information to state school agencies or officials, and the experts named by others were even more likely to mention this source of advice than those who named themselves as experts.

In the larger study from which the data in this report have been drawn the members of the four legislatures were classified according to their representational roles. Those who indicated that they made legislative decisions primarily on the basis of their own judgement or conviction were classified as "Trustees", while those who indicated that they made decisions mainly on the basis of advice or instructions from outside sources were classified as "Delegates". Legislators who expressed both of these orientations were classified as "Politicos". It was expected that the Politicos would be more flexible than the other representational role types and less dogmatic in their decision-making behavior.[9]

Table 15 shows the relation of these representational roles to sources of advice mentioned as most reliable on the matter of school needs. The most obvious difference among the representational role types to be noted in this table is that between the Politicos and the Trustees in the likelihood of mentioning fellow members as a source of reliable information. This appears to be consistent with the expectation that the Politicos would be more flexible and less dogmatic in their decision-making behavior. The data in Table 15 also suggest that Politicos were somewhat more likely than Delegates to rely on the advice of state school agencies or officials.

Table 15

SOURCES OF ADVICE ON SCHOOL NEEDS BY REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE

Q. 33. "On this particular subject of school needs, where would you get your most reliable information -- what source of advice and information would you trust the most?"

	Representational Role		
	Trustee N=162	Delegate N=37	Politico N=41
Local school officials	36%	35%	29%
State or local educational associations	43	32	39
State school agencies or officials	30	24	34
Own personal experience or research; experience of friends or relatives, etc.	19	14	22
Teachers, educators	11	24	12
Fellow members, committee members, study commissions of legislature	10	14	24
Other state agencies or officials	18	14	5
Legislative service agencies: Reference Service, State Library, etc.	10	19	12
Other interest groups	14	16	7
Other local government agencies or officials	2	5	2
Other sources	10	5	15
More than one source	62	68	62

We note that Delegates were more likely than Trustees to say that they got reliable information from teachers and educators, and this is consistent with the expectation that the Delegate would want to follow instructions from relevant clienteles. The fact that the Delegates were less likely than the Trustees to rely on the advice of educational associations may indicate that the Delegates regard these groups with suspicion as one of the competing clienteles for representation of teachers and educators.

Rating of Influentials

The data on sources of advice presented in the preceding section were obtained in a free answer type question, and in order to get a more precise picture of the various factors that influenced the legislators thinking on educational matters we supplemented this with a closed question. Each of the respondents was handed a card on which the following items were listed:

a. views of friends in the legislature
b. advice of party leaders
c. word from people in your district
d. report of Legislative Commission or Legislative Council
e. committee recommendation
f. views of administrative agencies
g. views of interest groups or lobbies
h. other (specify)

The legislators were asked to indicate whether each of these items had been very important, important, not very important, or not at all important in leading them to see the school needs problem as they did. Since there was some variation in the respondents' interpretation of the various categories of importance, it appeared more meaningful to code these data on the basis of which items were ranked highest and which ranked lowest by each respondent.

It can be seen in Table 16 that a little over one-fourth of the legislators placed the views of friends in the legislature in the highest category. Californians were more likely, and New Jersey members less likely to give a high rating to this category. One tentative explanation for this difference is the fact that the New Jersey legislators commute to the sessions in Trenton, and have considerably less opportunity for personal contacts with other members outside the legislative chamber, in contrast to the situation in California where most of the members establish residences in Sacramento for the duration of the session.

A majority of the legislators in each of the states placed the advice of party leaders in the lowest category, and it can be seen in Table 16 that Californians were even more likely than those in the other states to take this position.

In each of the states the category which received the largest percentage in the highest ranking was "word from people in the district", but it can be seen in Table 16 that a somewhat smaller proportion of New Jersey members gave this item the highest rating than was the case in the other states.

The reports of the Legislative Council or Study Commissions received a relatively high rating in Ohio, and some attention in Tennessee. It should be pointed out that this category is blank in California and New Jersey due to the fact that there was nothing equivalent to a Study Commission or Legislative Council in those two states.

The relative ranking given to committee recommendations gives an accurate reflection of the part played by committees in the legislative process in each of the four states. In California and Ohio, where committees play a major role in legislative decisions, a considerable proportion of the legislators placed committee recommendations in the highest ranking category, but committees were ranked much lower in Tennessee, and in New Jersey four-fifths of the respondents gave the lowest ranking to committee influence.

Table 16

RATING OF INFLUENTIALS BY STATE

Q. 37. "Just to get an overall picture, how important would you rate each of these items in leading you to see this school needs problem as you do?"

	California N=82		New Jersey N=66		Ohio N=149		Tennessee N=112		Total N=409	
	Ranked Highest	Ranked Lowest	Ranked Highest	Ranked Lowest	Ranked Highest	Ranked Lowest	Ranked Highest	Ranked Lowest	Ranked Highest	Ranked Lowest
Views of friends in legislature	37%	24%	14%	52%	25%	32%	27%	22%	26%	31%
Advice of party leaders	6	73	8	61	14	52	11	56	11	59
Word from people in district	62	9	49	18	59	14	64	6	59	12
Legislative Commissions, Legislative Council	---	---	---	---	45	22	32	27	25	16
Committee recommendations	38	19	3	83	44	15	19	38	29	33
Views of administrative agencies	28	30	41	20	29	28	16	28	27	27
Views of interest groups or lobbies	15	39	41	24	13	49	6	49	16	43
Others	7	---	44	---	1	---	12	---	12	---

Table 17

RATING OF INFLUENTIALS BY ATTITUDE

Q. 37. "Just to get an overall picture, how important would you rate each of these items in leading you to see this school needs problem as you do?"

	Attitude Toward Education							
	Favorable N=181		Ambivalent N=77		Unfavorable N=76		Neutral N=69	
	Ranked Highest	Ranked Lowest	Ranked Highest	Ranked Lowest	Ranked Highest	Ranked Lowest	Ranked Highest	Ranked Lowest
Views of friends in legislature	30%	27%	18%	42%	25%	23%	25%	39%
Advice of party leaders	9	61	10	61	11	65	16	52
Word from people in district	65	10	60	12	58	13	49	14
Legislative Commission, Legislative Council	20	11	30	18	33	16	26	25
Committee recommendations	29	35	23	46	29	27	35	25
Views of administrative agencies	28	24	32	25	25	32	22	30
Views of interest groups or lobbies	19	37	22	50	9	43	10	52
Others	13	---	10	---	8	---	14	---

A little over one-fourth of the total group of legislators ranked views of administrative agencies in the highest category, but it can also be seen in Table 16 that the same proportion ranked administrative agencies in the lowest category. It appears that there may have been some variation in the legislators' interpretation of the term "administrative agencies". From the comments made during the interviewing it appeared that New Jersey members, who gave this category a relatively high rating, usually had reference to local and state school administrators. It may be that the relatively low ranking given to this category in Tennessee was due to a differing interpretation of the term. It will be recalled from Table 13 that in contrast with those in the other states, Tennesseeans were somewhat less likely to mention local school officials, but considerably more likely to mention non-educational state agencies and officials as a trusted source of advice.

New Jersey lawmakers differed markedly from those in the other three states in the proportion who gave highest ranking to the views of interest groups or lobbies. This is consistent with the data shown in Table 13 which indicated that educational associations were more likely to be mentioned as a trusted source of advice and information in New Jersey than in the other three states.

Yet another contrast between New Jersey and the other states is noted in the "other" category in Table 16. This category includes all factors mentioned by the respondent in addition to the items on the rating list. Most of the legislators in this category said that their views on the school needs problem were primarily the result of their own personal experience, study, or observations.

The rating of influentials classified according to attitude toward education is shown in Table 17. The most obvious difference to be observed in this table is the relatively high rating given to the views of interest groups or lobbies by those legislators who were favorable or ambivalent toward education, in contrast to those who were unfavorable or neutral.

A possible explanation of the attitude toward education demonstrated by those in the neutral category is indicated by the fact that they were less likely than other legislators to say that word from people in their districts had been an important influence on their views. We note that, as might logically be expected, the neutrals also differed from the other attitude categories in giving a somewhat higher rating to committee recommendations. The ambivalents tended to give a rather low rating to committee recommendations, and both the ambivalents and neutrals were more likely than those who took a position either pro or con, to give a low rating to the views of friends in the legislature.

The fact that legislators in the favorable category appear to have been less likely than those in the unfavorable category to give a high rating to the influence of legislative commissions or a Legislative Council appears to have been due to the fact that this category of influential was not applicable in the two states (California and New Jersey) that had the highest percentage of legislators who were favorable to education.

The rating of influentials by the three representational role types is shown in Table 18. From the previous discussion in connection with Table 15 it will be recalled that those classified in representational role of Delegate indicated that they regarded it as important to follow instructions from various clientele groups in their decision-making behavior, whereas the Trustees said that they made decisions and voted on the basis of their own conviction or judgement. Accordingly, we would expect that the Delegates, in contrast to the Trustees, would be more likely to give a high rating to word from people in their districts, and this is shown to

Table 18

RATING OF INFLUENTIALS BY REPRESENTATIONAL ROLE AND AREAL ORIENTATION

	Representational Role						Areal Orientation					
	Trustee N=161		Delegate N=38		Politico N=42		District N=113		District-State N=72		State N=56	
	Ranked Highest	Ranked Lowest	Ranked Highest	Ranked Lowest	Ranked Highest	Ranked Lowest	Ranked Highest	Ranked Lowest	Ranked Highest	Ranked Lowest	Ranked Highest	Ranked Lowest
Views of friends in legislature	27%	32%	16%	32%	26%	26%	17%	35%	25%	32%	41%	27%
Advice of party leaders	12	55	8	55	12	62	5	62	7	61	16	64
Word from people in district	55	12	74	3	67	5	71	4	60	7	46	16
Legislative Commission, Legislative Council	38	16	11	21	19	10	21	12	26	14	29	16
Committee recommendations	29	32	16	42	24	43	24	33	25	36	37	37
Views of administrative agencies	25	28	26	18	31	29	24	26	29	28	32	21
Views of interest groups or lobbies	14	52	18	37	19	29	16	36	13	50	13	54
Others	16	---	8	---	14	---	10	---	15	---	9	---

be the case in Table 18. The data in this table also indicate that the Delegates were somewhat less likely than the other representational role types to give a high rating to the views of friends in the legislature or to committee recommendations. The Trustees were considerably more likely than the other representational role types to say that they had been influenced by a study commission or the Legislative Council, and we also note that in addition to giving a relatively less favorable ranking to word from people in the district, the Trustees were much more likely than the politicos or delegates to rank the views of interest groups or lobbies in the lowest influential category. This appears consistent with the role expectation of the Trustee that he would follow his own judgement or conviction in making legislative decisions.

Table 18 also presents the rating of influentials in relation to the areal orientation of the legislators.[10] Legislators classified as "District-Oriented" described their jobs primarily in terms of serving the interests of their constituents, while the "State-Oriented" representatives placed major emphasis on the legislative task of dealing with state-wide problems. It can be seen in Table 18 that the District-Oriented legislators were much more likely than those who were State-Oriented to give the highest ranking to the influence of word from people in their districts in the development of their views on the matter of school needs. The State-Oriented legislators, on the other hand, were considerably more likely to give a high rating to the views of friends in the legislature, and somewhat more likely to give the highest rating to committee recommendations and the views of administrative agencies. It is also to be noted that the State-Oriented lawmakers were more likely than the District-Oriented to rank the views of interest groups or lobbies in the lowest category.

Table 19

RATING OF IMPORTANCE OF INTEREST GROUPS BY GROUP ROLE TYPE

Q. 37. "Just to get an overall picture, how important would you rate each of these items in leading you to see this school needs problem as you do?"

	Group Role Orientation Type					
	Facilitaters N=149		Neutrals N=144		Resisters N=104	
	Ranked Highest	Ranked Lowest	Ranked Highest	Ranked Lowest	Ranked Highest	Ranked Lowest
Views of interest groups or lobbies	19%	37%	17%	41%	12%	55%

	Group Role Orientation Type		
	Facilitaters N=146	Neutrals N=137	Resisters N=101
Views of interest groups or lobbies are important	71%	57%	40%
Views of interest groups or lobbies are not important	29	43	60

Another major analytical variable developed in the State Legislative Research project was the role of the legislator toward interest groups. On the basis of their attitudes toward groups and lobbies, and their awareness of group activity, the legislators were classified into three major role orientation types. Those who were both highly favorable toward, and highly aware of, group activity were labeled "Facilitaters", while those who were aware of group activity and hostile toward it were called "Resisters". Legislators who had neither favorable or unfavorable attitudes toward group activity and/or those who had little awareness of such activity were categorized as "Neutrals".[11]

It can be seen in Table 19 that there was a difference, in the direction that would be expected, between the Facilitaters and the Resisters in the ranking that they gave to the importance of the views of interest groups or lobbies in determining their views on the matter of school needs. The second part of Table 19 shows that a similar positive relationship was found between the group role orientation types and a simple dichotomization of the legislators into those who said that interest groups were important and those who said that groups were not important in leading them to see the school needs problem as they did.

Table 20

RATING OF IMPORTANCE OF ADVICE OF PARTY LEADERS BY PARTY ORIENTATION TYPE

	Party Orientation					
	Democrats			Republicans		
	Weak N=67	Moderate N=54	Regular N=71	Weak N=51	Moderate N=47	Regular N=108
Advice of party leaders ranked highest	9%	7%	14%	4%	15%	13%
Advice of party leaders ranked lowest	61%	69%	55%	78%	51%	51%

	Party Orientation					
	Democrats			Republicans		
	Weak N=64	Moderate N=51	Regular N=69	Weak N=50	Moderate N=45	Regular N=101
Advice of party leaders important	31%	20%	49%	24%	47%	46%
Advice of party leaders not important	69	80	51	76	53	54
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The final major variable taken from the larger study that will be given some attention in this section is a measure that was obtained of the legislators' orientation toward political parties. On the basis of their scores on a Guttman-type scale each of the respondents was assigned to a party orientation type. "Regular Party Men" were those who felt that parties should play an important part in the legislative process, while "Weak Party Men" rejected parties as a major political influence. A group of the legislators whose attitudes toward parties were in between these two extremes were labeled "Moderate Party Men".[12]

It will be recalled from the data presented in Table 16 that the advice of party leaders on the matter of school needs was given quite a low influential ranking in all of the states. None the less we can see in Table 20 that there was an observable positive relation between strength of party orientation and rating of the advice of party leaders as influential with reference to the school needs problem. Regular Party Men were somewhat more likely to place the advice of party leaders in the highest influential category, in contrast to the Weak Party Men who were considerably more likely to consider party advice of least importance. This difference between the Weak Party Men and the Regulars is even more apparent in the second part of Table 20 where each of the three party orientation types is shown divided simply into those who rated party advice as important and those who said that it was not important.

Part III

PERCEIVED ATTITUDES OF CONSTITUENTS, FELLOW MEMBERS, AND LOBBIES

Contacts from Constituents

After the legislators had given their own solutions to the problem of school needs, they were asked several questions regarding their perceptions of the attitudes on this matter of people in their districts, fellow members of the legislature, and interest groups or lobbies.

When the respondents were asked to indicate which of the voters in their districts agreed with them on the matter of school needs, and which ones differed, the replies were not very meaningful in terms of specific groups of voters. A majority of the legislators said that they thought that most of the people in their districts agreed with whatever position the particular legislator described as his own viewpoint.

In the next question, however, some quite significant data were obtained by asking each of the lawmakers how many contacts he had had from people in his district who wanted to express their views on the matter of school needs.

It is apparent in Table 21 that there was considerable difference among the states in the number of contacts from constituents reported. New Jersey and Tennessee legislators reported many more contacts than those in the other two states, and there was also a considerable difference between California and Ohio in the number of contacts reported, with the latter state having the largest proportion (over one-third) who said that they had had no contacts whatever from constituents with regard to the matter of school needs.

We note in the second part of Table 21 that there was a rather marked relation between attitude toward education and number of contacts reported. Legislators who were favorable toward education were considerably more likely than those who were unfavorable, to indicate that they had had more than 35 contacts from constituents. It can also be observed that, in contrast to those who were favorable or ambivalent, legislators unfavorable to education were much more likely to have had no communications whatever from their districts on the school needs matter. It seemed unlikely that this relation between attitude and contacts was merely a function of differences in both attitude and number of contacts among the four states, since it could be observed that the rank order of the states on these two variables was different. In terms of favorable attitude toward education the rank order was (1) California (2) New Jersey (3) Tennessee and (4) Ohio; while the rank order in number of contacts was (1) Tennessee (2) New Jersey (3) California and (4) Ohio. However, since Ohio was last in both of these rank orderings, and since that state

Table 21

NUMBER OF CONTACTS FROM CONSTITUENTS ON PROBLEM OF SCHOOL NEEDS BY STATE AND ATTITUDE

Q. 36b. "Have any of your constituents contacted you to express their views on it? About how many communications about this matter -- letters, telegrams, phone calls, personal visits, etc. -- have you received from people in your district?"

State	No Contacts	Fewer than 36 contacts	36-250 contacts	More than 250 contacts	Some contacts number not specified	Total
California N=76	20%	36	28	12	4	100%
New Jersey N=70	6%	8	27	50	9	100%
Ohio N=153	34%	26	15	6	19	100%
Tennessee N=113	4%	11	47	33	5	100%
Total N=411	18%	21	28	22	11	100%
Attitude Toward Education						
Favorable N=184	14%	20	33	28	5	100%
Ambivalent N=76	12%	29	30	13	16	100%
Unfavorable N=74	33%	15	19	17	16	100%
Neutral N=73	23%	19	22	21	15	100%

contained a high proportion of the total group of legislators, it appeared desirable to do a separate state by state analysis of the relationship between number of contacts and attitude.

This analysis showed that in each of the individual states the legislators who were unfavorable included a higher proportion than any of the other attitude categories, of legislators who reported no contacts from constituents. It was also apparent that, in each of the individual states, legislators who reported more than 35 contacts were more likely than those with fewer contacts, to be favorable in their attitude on the problem of school needs.

Some indication of the great interest in the problem of school needs by widely diverse groups is shown in Table 22 which depicts the kind of people who had contacted the legislators on this matter. As might have been expected, a large proportion of the contacts were from teachers and teachers' organizations, but there was considerable difference in the pattern of contacts among the four states. Two-thirds of the Tennessee lawmakers, and more than one-half of those in New Jersey reported contacts from teachers, but there was a somewhat smaller proportion of teacher contacts in California, and in Ohio only one-fifth of the legislators said that they had heard from teachers or teachers' organizations. In contrast, the Ohioans were somewhat more likely than those in the other states to indicate that they had been contacted on the school needs problem by school administrators or board members.

Table 22 also indicates that Parent Teacher Associations and other parent groups were considerably more active in making contacts in New Jersey than in the other three states, and in this case too the smallest percentage of contacts was reported in Ohio.

Some legislators in each of the four states reported contacts from tax conscious constituents, and it can be seen in Table 22 that groups sensitive to business or income taxes were somewhat more likely to be heard from in Tennessee, while the New Jersey lawmakers reported a somewhat higher proportion of contacts from groups sensitive to property taxes. These differences are doubtless due to the existing and contemplated sources of revenue in each of these states in 1957. As has already been noted, the legislators also reported at least some contacts from quite a wide variety of constituents, and some of them merely indicated that they had been contacted by a cross-section of the people in their districts.

The second part of Table 22 shows the kind of constituents who contacted respondents in the various attitude categories. We have already noted in our discussion of Table 21 that those who were unfavorable or neutral to education were more likely to say that they had had no contacts at all from constituents, and we note in Table 22 that the legislators favorable to education were considerably more likely than the other attitudinal categories to report that they had been contacted by teachers or parent groups. There was no difference, however, in the proportions of the favorable and unfavorable categories who reported communications from school officials or board members.

While the differences are relatively small, it seems worthy of mention that the only two constituent categories which had more contacts with unfavorable than with favorable legislators were "rural interests" and local government officials and employees. In connection with mentioning the latter category, several of the legislators noted that non-educational local government employees were in competition with teachers for a share of the tax dollar.

Table 22

KIND OF CONSTITUENTS WHO CONTACTED RESPONDENT BY STATE AND BY ATTITUDE

Q. 36d. "What kind of people were those who contacted you?"

	State					Attitude Toward Education			
	California N=76	New Jersey N=70	Ohio N=153	Tennessee N=113	Total N=412	Favorable N=184	Ambivalent N=76	Unfavorable N=74	Neutral N=73
Teachers (including teachers' organizations)	40%	54%	20%	66%	42%	51%	40%	32%	29%
Parents, PTA's, other parent groups	24	63	18	31	30	37	28	23	23
School officials, administrators, board members, including organized groups	24	24	33	13	25	22	30	22	29
Groups sensitive to income/ business taxes: high income people; Chamber of Commerce; businessmen; specific business groups	5	7	5	19	9	11	13	7	3
Groups sensitive to property-tax: property-owners; home-owners; real estate groups	4	19	3	4	6	5	12	4	5
A cross-section	8	4	3	12	7	10	5	3	4
Rural interests (rural areas, districts; poor districts; small towns; farmers; farm groups; etc.)	1	---	4	10	4	4	5	8	1
Local government officials and employees	1	6	---	7	3	3	4	7	---
Civic groups (Legion; Rotary; Lions, etc.)	1	7	3	4	3	5	1	1	3
Professional groups (doctors, lawyers, accountants, etc.)	---	---	1	9	3	3	3	3	1
No contacts from constituents	20	6	35	4	14	14	12	32	23

When asked what percentage of their constituents who had contacted them agreed with their positions on the school needs problem, a majority of the legislators in each of the four states indicated that over 75% of their constituents agreed with them, but we note in Table 23 that California and Tennessee legislators were more likely than those in New Jersey and Ohio to indicate that their positions were not in agreement with a majority of their constituents. In the second part of Table 23 it can be seen that the legislators who were unfavorable to education were somewhat more likely than those in the other attitude categories to perceive themselves in disagreement with a majority of their constituents, and much less likely to say that over 75% of their constituent contacts had been in agreement with their positions. Legislators apparently perceive the climate of opinion as favoring education on the whole, and are conscious of running counter to public opinion when they advocate economy or retrenchment.

Table 23

PERCENTAGE OF CONSTITUENTS AGREEING WITH LEGISLATOR ON PROBLEM OF SCHOOL NEEDS

Q. 36c. "About what percentage of them agreed with your position?"

	Percentage Agreeing				
State	50% or less	51-75%	Over 75%	Can't guess, don't know	Total
California (N=55)	24%	9%	64%	3%	100%
New Jersey (N=60)	15	8	75	2	100%
Ohio (N=69)	10	10	74	6	100%
Tennessee (N=108)	33	11	54	2	100%
Total (N=292)	22	10	65	3	100%
Attitude Toward Education					
Favorable (N=150)	21	9	67	3	100%
Ambivalent (N=60)	22	8	70	---	100%
Unfavorable (N=37)	38	19	35	8	100%
Neutral (N=40)	15	5	75	5	100%

Attitudes of Fellow Members

Each of the respondents was also asked to indicate how he thought most of the Republicans and most of the Democrats in his chamber felt about the school needs problem. While this question was stated in terms of whether most of the members of the two parties agreed or disagreed with the individual respondent's position, it seemed best to present the replies simply in terms of whether the respondent perceived differences or agreement between the two political parties on this issue. This has been done in Table 24, which shows that a majority of the legislators interviewed, in each of the four states, saw no differences between legislative members of the two parties on the school needs problem.

Table 24

PARTY MEMBERS' ATTITUDES ON PROBLEM OF SCHOOL NEEDS

Q. 34a. "Now, I would like you to help me find out how members of the House [Senate] generally feel about this school needs problem. (1) Take the Republicans, for instance. How do you think most of them feel about it? Do most of them agree with you, or disagree? (2) What about the Democrats? Do you think most of them agree with you on this, or disagree?"

	California N=74	New Jersey N=69	Ohio N=137	Tennessee N=111	Total N=391
Party attitude not relevant	27%	--%	3%	--%	6%
Republican and Democratic members in agreement on solution to school needs problem	53	80	71	50	64
Republican and Democratic members in disagreement as to solution for school needs problem	19	16	13	33	20
One or both parties don't care about school needs	--	--	1	2	1
Legislator did not know attitude of one or both parties	1	4	12	15	9
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 25

URBAN-RURAL MEMBERS' ATTITUDES ON PROBLEM OF SCHOOL NEEDS

Q. 34a. (2nd part). "(3) Have you any idea how most members from the rural districts feel about it? Would you say most of them agree with you, or disagree? (4) What about members from the city districts? Would you say most of them agree with you, or disagree?"

	California N=74	New Jersey N=69	Ohio N=138	Tennessee N=111	Total N=392
Urban-rural attitude not relevant	5%	--%	2%	--%	2%
Urban and rural members in agreement on solution to school needs problem	54	58	41	44	47
Urban and rural members in disagreement as to solution for school needs problem	28	36	45	38	38
One or both don't care about school needs	1	3	2	4	2
Legislator does not know attitude of one or both	12	3	10	14	11
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The fact that Republican and Democratic members were more likely to be perceived in disagreement in Tennessee than in the other three states was probably a reflection of the fact, previously noted, that a battle over the Democratic Governor's General Education Bill was one of the major events of the 1957 legislative session in that state. In this fight the Republican legislators gave strong support to efforts by the Tennessee Education Association to have the bill amended to provide for greater teacher salary increases.

Table 25 shows the result of the second part of the question discussed above, which asked for the legislators' perceptions of the attitudes of fellow members from rural and city districts. It can be seen in this table that a majority of those interviewed in California and New Jersey saw no differences between rural and urban legislators on the school needs matter. In Ohio and Tennessee, however, there were relatively larger proportions who indicated that there were differences between the rural and urban members in the way they felt about educational matters.

A somewhat different approach to the problem of conflicting attitudes on school needs is shown in Table 26. In this case the legislators were asked to rank a series of possible opinion conflicts in order of their importance on the school needs issue. Earlier in the interview the respondents had been asked to rank these same conflicts of opinion in the legislature, without reference to any specific problem area.

Perhaps the most interesting thing to be noted in this table is the relatively high proportion of legislators who said that none of the listed conflicts of opinion were important with reference to the school needs issue. This tendency to regard the school problem as removed from general political conflicts in the legislature was noticeable in all four states, but it can be seen in Table 26 that such an attitude was much more prevalent in New Jersey, and somewhat more noticeable in California than in the other two states.

The relatively low ranking given to conflict between Democrats and Republicans on the school needs issue shown in Table 26 is consistent with the data presented in Table 24 which showed that a majority of the legislators saw no party disagreement on this issue. Some indication of the extent to which New Jersey legislators regarded the school issue as insulated from general state politics is indicated by the fact that only eight per cent of those interviewed rated party conflict in first or second place on this issue, whereas when they had been asked to rank these same opinion conflicts without reference to a specific issue 84% of them placed party conflict in first or second place.

In Tennessee almost three-fourths of the legislators interviewed gave a high ranking to conflict between supporters and opponents of the governor on the school needs issue. This reflects the usual political situation in the Tennessee legislature which is normally divided into those who support and those who oppose the "administration". In the 1957 session the "administration" educational program was regarded as inadequate by the Tennessee Education Association and most other educational groups in the state.

A relatively high proportion of legislators in all four of the states gave a high ranking to conflict of opinion between legislators from cities and those from rural counties on the school needs issue, but it can be seen in Table 26 that this particular conflict was even more salient in Ohio (ranked first or second by 75%) than in the other states.

The data indicate that California legislators were considerably more likely than those in the other states to give a high ranking to liberal vs. conservative

Table 26

OPINION CONFLICTS RANKED FIRST OR SECOND ON SCHOOL NEEDS BY STATE AND ATTITUDE

Q. 38b. "This is the list of different conflicts of opinion that we mentioned a while ago. How would you rank these opinion-conflicts in the order of their importance on this issue of school needs?"

	State					Attitude Toward Education			
	California N=82	New Jersey N=67	Ohio N=150	Tennessee N=111	Total N=410	Favorable N=180	Ambivalent N=76	Unfavorable N=76	Neutral N=72
Can't rank; none important	24%	43%	15%	17%	22%	26%	24%	13%	20%
Republicans vs. Democrats	9	8	15	14	12	12	18	9	11
Governor's supporters vs. opponents	7	3	19	73	29	28	38	33	26
Cities vs. rural counties	35	40	75	41	52	46	47	68	57
Liberals vs. conservatives	55	19	28	18	29	32	32	28	21
Labor vs. opponents of labor	31	4	3	1	8	11	9	4	3
Geographical conflicts	2	9	18	1	9	5	13	14	8

conflict on the school needs matter. Because of the widely differing possible interpretations of these terms, we hesitate to make much of this difference, but it does seem to suggest that Californians were more likely to see a link between a legislator's general political and economic philosophy and the position that he took on the matter of school needs. The fact that conflict between labor and opponents of labor was also ranked higher by California legislators would appear to support this tentative conclusion. Differences between labor and opponents of labor may have been more salient in California as a result of proposals during the 1957 session for taxes on beer and cigarettes as a source of school revenue. These proposals met with the formal opposition of certain pressure groups, including the unions.

In the ranking list which was handed the respondents, the "geographical conflicts" category was listed with a different specific referent in each state, e.g., Northern California vs. Southern California; North Jersey vs. South Jersey; Cleveland vs. the rest of the state; and East Tennessee vs. West Tennessee. It can be noted in Table 26 that this category was given a high ranking by a somewhat higher proportion of Ohio legislators than others. Since Cleveland is the largest urban area in Ohio, this appears to be consistent with the relatively high ranking given to rural-urban conflict in that state.

Table 26 also shows the relation of attitude toward education to the ranking of opinion conflicts in the legislature. To a certain extent these rankings appear to reflect differences among the four states both in attitude and ranking. It can be seen that a smaller proportion of those unfavorable than of the other attitude categories thought that none of the opinion conflicts listed were important in the school needs issue. It is also noted that legislators unfavorable to education were more likely than others to give a high ranking to rural-urban conflict on this issue.

Attitudes of Interest Groups and Lobbies

Before presenting the data on legislative perceptions of the attitudes of interest groups on the school needs issue, we shall present some information on the relative salience of educational interest groups or lobbies that were mentioned by the legislators. These data were obtained in a separate section of the interview schedule that preceded the series of questions on the school needs issue. In this section the legislators were asked a number of questions regarding the part played by interest groups or lobbies in the legislative process of their respective states. Among other questions, they were asked what were the most powerful groups in their states, which ones were most powerful in their own districts, and which ones "were particularly worth listening to", whether or not they happened to be powerful. Table 27 is based on the total number of references made to groups or interests in answer to these questions, or in any other part of the interview--with the exception of the section on school needs.[13]

We are concerned here, primarily, with the relative salience of educational interest groups in comparison with other groups or interests mentioned by the legislators in the four states.

Table 27 shows that educational interests were second only to business interests in number of mentions by legislators in California, New Jersey, and Tennessee.[14] In Ohio, however, educational interests received the same proportion of mentions as labor, while both of these were slightly exceeded by agricultural interests, and completed dwarfed by business interests in salience for the legislators. In noting the relatively lower salience of educational interest groups for Ohio legislators we are, of course, reminded that this state had a considerably lower proportion of legislators who were favorable in their attitude toward the problem of school needs.

Table 27

GENERAL SALIENCE OF DIFFERENT CLASSES OF INTEREST GROUPS*

	California N=838	New Jersey N=706	Ohio N=1428	Tennessee N=908	Four States Combined N=3880
Business	28%	29%	42%	38%	36%
Educational	20	20	12	20	17
Labor	15	16	12	14	14
Governmental	10	11	8	14	10
Agricultural	9	5	13	4	9
Professional	7	6	5	4	5
Ethnic, Demographic	2	3	2	2	2
Religious, Charitable, Civic	2	3	1	1	2
Miscellaneous	7	7	5	3	5
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* The "N" is the total number of references made to groups or interests.

Table 28

SALIENCE OF DIFFERENT CLASSES OF INTERESTS IN FOUR DIFFERENT CONTEXTS

	Context in Which Interest Was Mentioned			
	School Issue	General Power	Power in Constituency	Group Merit
California				
Educational	41%	21%	30%	5%
Business	34	35	10	28
Labor	12	16	21	5
Governmental	4	13	5	10
Agricultural	5	6	17	12
New Jersey				
Educational	43	18	43	8
Business	26	35	9	27
Labor	10	16	22	10
Governmental	9	11	4	15
Agricultural	1	4	12	2
Ohio				
Educational	50	14	12	9
Business	25	50	29	33
Labor	4	12	22	6
Governmental	5	6	4	14
Agricultural	11	13	23	9
Tennessee				
Educational	36	20	30	14
Business	17	48	21	32
Labor	5	13	24	5
Governmental	26	13	6	22
Agricultural	3	2	7	5

Table 28 gives an indication of the specific contexts in which various classes of interests were mentioned in each state. Educational interests were, of course, the ones most frequently mentioned in connection with the school issue in all four of the states, and it is interesting to note that, while educational interests were less likely to be mentioned in Ohio replies to the general questions on interests and lobbies, Ohioans were somewhat more likely than the lawmakers in the other three states to mention educational groups in connection with the school needs issue.

Business interests ranked second in salience in connection with the school needs issue in all of the states except Tennessee where it is to be noted that governmental interests received considerably more mention than in the other three states. The specific groups most often mentioned by Tennessee lawmakers in this connection were the Tennessee Municipal League and various associations of county officials.

Educational interests ranked second in the likelihood of being mentioned as among the most powerful groups in all four of the states, but it is to be noted that this was a rather "poor second", particularly in Ohio, and that in the latter state the educational interests were only slightly more likely than agriculture and labor to be mentioned as among the most powerful.

When the legislators were asked which groups were particularly strong in their own districts, however, we note that educational interests were the ones most frequently mentioned everywhere but in Ohio. The relatively low salience of educational interests in Ohio in the context of constituency power gives us additional evidence which helps to explain why that State had the smallest proportion of legislators who were favorable to education.

The final context, which is labeled "Group Merit" in Table 28, included all mentions of groups or interests whose advice the legislators thought ought to be considered whether or not the groups happened to be powerful. We might expect educational interests to fare rather poorly in this context in Ohio, but it is somewhat surprising to find that they also ranked quite low in this context in the other three states. It seems plain that, particularly in comparison with business, educational groups were not regarded as "particularly worth listening to" by a very large proportion of the lawmakers in any of the states in our study.

Whereas the preceding two tables deal with general classes of interest groups, Table 29 shows the relative salience of specific interest groups mentioned by the legislators in various contexts. While business interests in general were more salient than educational interests in all four of the states studied, there was no specific business group in any of the four states that was as salient as the state education association. The education associations ranked first in total number of mentions by legislators in every state except Ohio, where the OEA ranked second to the Ohio Farm Bureau.

The education associations were, as expected, the most frequently mentioned groups in connection with the school issue in all four states, but it is probably considerably more significant that they also ranked first when the legislators were asked to name the most powerful groups in their states. In California, New Jersey, and Tennessee, the legislators also ranked the education associations first in constituency power. In Ohio, however, the legislators were much more likely to mention the Farm Bureau, and somewhat more likely to mention the Grange and the Chamber of Commerce, than the Ohio Education Association, when they were asked what groups were particularly strong in their own districts.

The Tennessee Education Association appears to have been quite highly regarded by Tennessee legislators since we note that it was mentioned more frequently than

Table 29
RELATIVE SALIENCE OF SPECIFIC INTEREST GROUPS IN VARIOUS CONTEXTS

Organization	Context in which Group was Named				
	General	School Issue	General Power	Const. Power	Group Merit
California (56 organizations named)					
California Teachers Assoc.	35%	47%	42%	34%	5%
PTA(s)	5	8	4	10	5
AFL-CIO	12	4	16	7	2
California Medical Assoc.	8	---	8	5	2
California Farm Bureau	11	3	4	25	20
League of California Cities	8	1	8	5	12
California Supervisors Assoc.	7	1	9	3	8
Chamber(s) of Commerce	5	17	4	2	12
League of Women Voters	3	---	1	2	12
California State Grange	2	1	2	5	2
Friends Legislative Comm.	2	---	1	---	12
California Taxpayers Assoc.	2	18	1	2	8
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
New Jersey (38 organizations named)					
New Jersey Education Assoc.	28%	35%	30%	47%	11%
PTA(s)	2	11	1	4	---
Chamber(s) of Commerce	20	11	20	12	25
AFL-CIO	20	14	23	24	10
N. J. Municipal League	9	7	7	---	17
N. J. Taxpayers Assoc.	8	14	5	---	21
N. J. Manufacturers Assoc.	5	4	7	4	2
League of Women Voters	5	4	3	4	12
N. J. Farm Bureau	3	---	4	5	2
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Ohio (68 organizations named)					
Ohio Education Assoc.	18%	53%	24%	9%	9%
PTA(s)	2	5	1	4	3
Ohio Farm Bureau	24	12	22	37	17
Chamber(s) of Commerce	15	17	14	15	21
Ohio State Grange	9	4	7	15	8
AFL-CIO	8	---	9	8	4
Ohio Manufacturers Assoc.	8	6	12	3	2
Ohio Council of Retail Merchants	7	---	6	4	14
Ohio Medical Association	6	1	5	3	11
League of Women Voters	3	2	---	2	11
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Tennessee (46 organizations named)					
Tennessee Education Assoc.	37%	46%	37%	53%	25%
PTA(s)	2	5	2	4	2
Tennessee Municipal League	17	17	16	8	23
Tennessee Manufacturers Assoc.	15	5	18	7	16
Tennessee County Services Assoc.	14	19	14	6	19
Tennessee Farm Bureau	5	3	4	7	6
"Trading Stamps" (ad hoc group)	4	---	6	2	---
AFL-CIO	3	---	2	13	---
Tennessee Taxpayers Assoc.	3	5	1	---	9
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

any other single group when the legislators were asked to name groups that were "particularly worth listening to". In the other three states, however, the education associations were far down the list in terms of the likelihood of being mentioned as a group whose advice ought to be considered, whether or not it happened to be powerful.

These data on the perceived strength of state education associations by state legislators appear to be fairly consistent with Corey's findings which were based on questionnaires sent to executive secretaries of all the state education associations, and to the heads of five other organization leaders in all states. The replies to these questionnaires indicated that the education association lobby was regarded as among the strongest in all of the states, but in relatively few states was it judged by interest group leaders to be more powerful than any other lobby.[15]

Corey suggested that public recognition of the education associations as a powerful influence on the legislature may represent

> evidence of real influence, or it might be strategy on the part of opposition groups which wish to foster the fear and suspicion which is always generated against too great a concentration of power.

He reported that the executive secretaries of the state educational associations generally believed that the recognition of the power of their organizations was sincerely expressed, but they also indicated that this reputation of power was often used against them.

We have noted that the education associations were the most frequently mentioned powerful group in the four states in our study, but that, except in Tennessee, they were not very frequently mentioned as a group worth listening to, regardless of power. In order to get a better understanding of the background of these findings, we took another close look at some of the interview remarks with regard to the power and merit of the education associations.

Many of the legislators indicated that the greatest strength of the education lobby derived from the fact that education was generally in public favor. As one legislator put it

> They have a veil you can't pierce. How the hell can you attack education?

There were also comments to the effect that the education associations were well organized to accomplish their objectives, well financed, and able to make effective use of other organizations such as the Parent Teacher Associations. A few quotations from the interviews will illustrate these attitudes.

> There's a strong organization with money, and they dominate the legislature.
>
> The education lobby has got the most money and they employ a lot of people.
>
> Their proposals have the groundwork laid before the elections.
>
> They stick together and don't quit.
>
> They combine with the PTA.

The PTA backs them up.

We can also get some hints from specific interview remarks as to why the education associations were not likely to be ranked very high in terms of group merit. A few of the legislators expressed rather extreme outright hostility to the education organizations. For example the following:

> What a bunch of bastards. It's the greatest racket--they always go to parents and make emotional appeals.
>
> They're a bunch of liars. I don't pay any attention to them.

The typical unfavorable comment was not so hostile as those given above, but considerably more reasonable. For example:

> Education groups put on too much pressure. Although I have supported school bills, I resent some of their tactics. The Education Association uses PTA's to apply pressure. These PTA groups will endorse most any educational legislation in an unthinking manner.
>
> Too much legislation benefiting teachers offends other local and municipal employees who are more important politically than teachers.

The line taken in the latter quotation was heard rather frequently. Many legislators felt that the education groups have not had proper regard for the needs of other public employees, and there were suggestions that teachers were generally unreliable and unimportant politically--in the sense that legislators friendly to schools could not rely on support from teachers. In this connection, it should be noted that a majority of the organization leaders, to whom Corey sent questionnaires, felt that the education association leaders did not balance the needs of teachers with the general welfare.[16]

In contrast to the unfavorable comments from other states, were the following comments from Tennessee interviews, where, it will be recalled, the Education Association was the group most frequently mentioned as particularly worth listening to.

> They represent people who are vitally interested in state affairs.
>
> They are in close touch with the people at home.
>
> They know their needs better than we do.
>
> The membership includes outstanding people of the state--leading citizens.
>
> They're a pretty good bunch of people. Try to do what's right.

We will now turn to a discussion of the legislators' perceptions of which groups or interests agreed or disagreed with the solution to the problem of school needs that was suggested by the legislator in the interview. This perception of agreement or disagreement is meaningful only in terms of the attitudes of the individual legislators, and that is the way it is presented in Table 30. We were impressed with the consistency shown in this table, in that classes of interests perceived as agreeing by legislators favorable to education were also perceived as disagreeing by legislators who were unfavorable. Legislators favorable to education were, of course, likely to perceive themselves as in agreement with educational interests, and those who were unfavorable were likely to see educational interests in disagreement with their positions. Business interests, on the other hand, were likely to be perceived as in agreement with those legislators unfavorable to education and in disagreement to those in the favorable category.[17] A similar consistency is shown in the legislators' perceptions of the positions of governmental interests (in agreement with unfavorable legislators) and labor interests (in agreement favorable legislators), although these latter two classes of interest were considerably less salient than educational or business interests in the legislative discussions of the school issue.

Table 30

GROUP INTERESTS AGREEING AND DISAGREEING ON ISSUE OF SCHOOL NEEDS

Q. 34b. "How do the interest groups or lobbies that are affected by this manner of school needs line up on it? Which ones would you say feel pretty much as you do about it, and which ones disagree with you on it?"

	Attitude Toward Education							
	Favorable		Ambivalent		Unfavorable		Neutral	
	Agree N=255*	Disagree N=203	Agree N=95	Disagree N=67	Agree N=78	Disagree N=54	Agree N=55	Disagree N=43
Class of Interest								
Agricultural	6%	2%	11%	3%	9%	4%	5%	---%
Business	13	48	29	29	28	13	13	14
Educational	55	22	41	37	39	63	47	42
Ethnic and demographic	3	1	---	---	---	---	2	---
Governmental	7	15	7	15	19	7	17	16
Labor	10	5	6	9	4	7	7	9
Professional	2	2	3	3	---	2	2	5
Religious, charitable, civic	2	1	---	1	---	2	2	9
Miscellaneous	2	4	3	3	1	2	5	5

*The "N" is the total number of mentions of groups or interests who agreed or disagreed with legislators in each attitude category.

Table 31 shows the pattern of perceived agreement and disagreement by legislators favorable to education in each individual state. (We have not included the other attitude categories in this table because of the small numbers involved.) This table shows that in each of the individual states the legislators favorable to education perceived themselves as being in agreement with educational interests and in disagreement with business interests. There were some interstate differences in the perception of the position of business interests, however, with Ohio legislators more likely and Tennesseeans less likely to perceive business interests in disagreement with a favorable attitude toward education. As has already been noted in the discussion of Table 28, governmental interests were considerably more salient in connection with the education issue in Tennessee than in the other three states, and it can be seen in Table 31 that Tennessee legislators who were favorable to education were likely to perceive governmental interests as in disagreement with their positions.

Table 31

GROUP INTERESTS AGREEING OR DISAGREEING WITH LEGISLATORS WHO HAD FAVORABLE ATTITUDES TOWARD EDUCATION BY STATE

	California		New Jersey		Ohio		Tennessee	
	Agree N=70*	Disagree N=56	Agree N=78	Disagree N=53	Agree N=50	Disagree N=34	Agree N=57	Disagree N=60
Class of Interest								
Agricultural	7%	4%	--%	--%	14%	3%	5%	2%
Business	26	50	5	62	10	70	11	20
Educational	50	32	60	13	58	18	53	23
Ethnic and demographic	---	---	8	4	4	---	---	---
Governmental	3	1	8	9	6	9	13	35
Labor	13	9	14	6	6	---	5	4
Professional	---	---	1	---	---	---	5	7
Religious, charitable, civic	1	---	---	---	---	---	5	2
Miscellaneous	---	4	4	6	2	---	3	7

*The "N" is the total number of mentions of groups or interests who agreed or disagreed with legislators in each attitude category.

Part IV

LOBBYIST PERCEPTIONS AND ROLL CALL ANALYSIS

As has already been indicated, the data presented in the previous sections were collected in interviews with legislators by participants in the State Legislative Research Project. In order to obtain a better background for analyzing the educational material in the interviews, we revisited each of the states in the study in 1959-60, for the purpose of conducting interviews with the lobbyists representing the state educational associations.

We did not use a formal interview schedule on these visits, but we asked the lobbyists in each of the states to describe the major educational problems that were facing their respective legislatures in the 1957 session, and to indicate which legislative bills had been of major concern to the educational profession.

We also asked the lobbyists to name any legislators in their states whom they regarded as particularly friendly or particularly unfriendly to education. Although this latter question was stated in general terms, it appeared that in their replies the lobbyists tended to identify friendly and unfriendly legislators in the context of the specific bills that they had mentioned in reply to the previous question. In retrospect, we think that it might have been better to have had them identify the friendly and unfriendly legislators before they were asked to discuss specific legislative bills. Our reasoning on this will be discussed below.

Lobbyists' Perceptions of Friendly and Unfriendly Legislators

In Table 32 we have shown the friendly and unfriendly legislators identified by educational lobbyists, classified according to the attitude toward education expressed by the legislator when he was interviewed for the State Legislative Research Project. We note in the four-state total in this table that "friendly" legislators were slightly more likely than those who were "unfriendly", to have expressed only favorable attitudes in the interview, considerably more likely to have expressed both favorable and unfavorable attitudes (ambivalent), and somewhat less likely to have been classified as unfavorable or neutral. Some discussion of the individual states may help to explain these differences, and also to suggest why the differences are smaller than might have been expected.

In California, out of eleven legislators identified by lobbyists as friendly to education, seven had been classified as favorable, one as ambivalent, and three were not asked the question on which the attitude measure was based. The California lobbyists mentioned only one unfriendly legislator, and he had been classified as favorable on the basis of his interview remarks. These results are not particularly surprising in view of the fact that almost two-thirds of the California Legislators interviewed expressed only favorable remarks in their discussion of the school needs problem.

In New Jersey there were eight legislators mentioned as friendly to education by educational lobbyists. Five of them were favorable in attitude, two were ambivalent, and the attitude of one was not ascertained. Of the four New Jersey Legislators identified as unfriendly, one was favorable, two were unfavorable, and one was neutral.

In contrast to the data shown for California and New Jersey, the Ohio results show that, if there was any relation between educational attitude and lobbyists' perceptions, it was in the opposite direction from what would have been expected. Of the fourteen legislators identified as friendly by Ohio educational lobbyists, four were favorable in attitude, two were ambivalent, three were unfavorable, four were neutral, and the attitude of one was not ascertained. In the unfriendly category, of twelve legislators listed, five were favorable, one was ambivalent, one unfavorable, three neutral, and two were not ascertained.

One explanation for the finding that there was no relationship between these two variables in Ohio is that the attitude measure was a very crude one, and that it may not have given a valid measure of the attitudes of Ohio Legislators on the school needs problem. However, in view of the fact that this attitudinal measure did prove to be related to other variables shown for Ohio Legislators in previous sections of this report, we think that another explanation may be more plausible.

As was noted above, the lobbyists were asked to name friendly and unfriendly legislators after they had discussed particular educational bills which had been important in the 1957 legislative session. In the interview with Ohio lobbyists, special emphasis was placed on one particular bill, and when they were asked to identify friendly and unfriendly legislators, it appeared to the interviewer that they did so in the context of the legislative vote on one of the roll calls on this bill. While this particular vote was quite salient for the lobbyists, we infer both from the subject matter of the bill and analysis of the roll call vote (these will be discussed in the following section of this report), that it may not have been regarded as a particularly salient educational bill by members of the legislature.

The Tennessee educational lobbyists identified twenty-six legislators as friendly to education, and of these thirteen were favorable in attitude, five were ambivalent, two were unfavorable, three were neutral, and the attitude of the other three was not ascertained. Only six legislators were identified as unfriendly by Tennessee educational lobbyists. The attitude of two of these was not ascertained, and the other four were all classified as favorable on the basis of their interview discussions of the school needs problem. These Tennessee data should be interpreted in the light of a remark made by one of the Tennessee lobbyists to the effect that there was "no real opposition to education" in the Tennessee Legislature, and that those legislators identified as unfriendly were those who had actively supported the administration education bill, which was regarded as inadequate by the Tennessee Education Association.

In summary, while we would not have expected that there would be a one to one relationship between attitudes expressed in the interview schedule and the likelihood that a legislator would be named as friendly or unfriendly by educational lobbyists, we did expect that there would be a closer relationship between these two variables than is shown in Table 32. This finding casts some doubt on the validity of our measure of attitude, but we are also inclined to think that the results in Tennessee and Ohio may have been affected by the particular interview context in which the lobbyists identified friendly and unfriendly legislators.

Table 32

EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS' PERCEPTIONS OF FRIENDLY AND UNFRIENDLY LEGISLATORS

	Attitude Toward Education					
	Favorable	Ambivalent	Unfavorable	Neutral	Not Ascertained	Total
Legislators mentioned as friendly to education by educational lobbyists						
California	7	1	-	-	3	11
New Jersey	5	2	-	-	1	8
Ohio	4	2	3	4	1	14
Tennessee	13	5	2	3	3	26
Total	29(49%)	10(17%)	5(8%)	7(12%)	8(14%)	59(100%)
Legislators mentioned as unfriendly to education by educational lobbyists						
California	1	-	-	-	-	1
New Jersey	1	-	2	1	-	4
Ohio	5	1	1	3	2	12
Tennessee	4	-	-	-	2	6
Total	11(48%)	1(5%)	3(13%)	4(17%)	4(17%)	23(100%)

Legislative Roll Call Votes on Education Bills

In this section we will discuss the relation of legislative attitudes to voting behavior as recorded in roll call votes on important educational bills. The existence of a considerable amount of data on the legislators' voting behavior in the official journals of the legislatures provided an opportunity, unfortunately rather rare in social science research, to compare behavior in an interview situation with behavior in an entirely different context. Roll call analysis is beset

Table 33

RELATION OF EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES TO CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY ROLL CALL VOTES

	Attitude Toward Education					
	Favorable	Ambivalent	Unfavorable	Neutral	Not Ascertained	Total
Assembly Bill 3045						
Vote 1						
Supporting CTA* N=42	48%	7	12	2	31	100%
Opposing CTA N=37	35%	5	14	11	35	100%
Vote 2						
Supporting CTA N=35	46%	9	11	3	31	100%
Opposing CTA N=43	39%	5	12	9	35	100%
Vote 3						
Supporting CTA N=41	51%	5	5	5	34	100%
Opposing CTA N=36	33%	8	18	8	33	100%
Vote 4						
Supporting CTA N=36	53%	5	14	3	25	100%
Opposing CTA N=40	35%	8	10	8	39	100%
Vote 5						
Supporting CTA N=37	43%	8	8	6	35	100%
Opposing CTA N=39	43%	5	13	8	31	100%
Vote 6						
Supporting CTA N=36	45%	8	8	6	35	100%
Opposing CTA N=40	42%	5	13	8	32	100%
Vote 7						
Supporting CTA N=37	51%	8	8	3	30	100%
Opposing CTA N=39	36%	5	13	10	36	100%
Assembly Bill 3046						
Supporting CTA N=29	41%	7	14	3	35	100%
Opposing CTA N=43	46%	7	12	7	28	100%

*California Teachers Association

with pitfalls, and it is frequently said that a legislative roll call conceals more than it reveals, but we felt that an effort to relate the two sets of data might produce interesting results.

Since the attitude measure was constructed from the legislators' general observations with regard to the whole school needs problem, we could hardly have expected that a particular legislator's attitude would be directly reflected in his vote on any particular bill, but we did think it reasonable to expect that for the total group of legislators in any one chamber it might be possible to show some positive relationship between behavior recorded in the interview situation and behavior recorded in the Legislative Journals. Within the limits of the data available, we tested this hypothesis in each of the four states.

The most important education measure considered by the California legislature in the 1957 session was Assembly Bill 3045, which provided for a considerable increase in State aid, as well as an increase in the minimum salary for teachers. This bill was sponsored by the California Teachers Association, and received the strongest support from their lobbyists during the fight for its passage.

There were at least eighteen roll call votes in connection with this bill in the California Assembly, and we have selected the seven of these where the votes were most equally divided (at least 35 votes recorded in the minority) for display in Table 33. Since the particular legislative situation with regard to each vote was necessarily somewhat complicated, we have labeled the two opposing viewpoints expressed in each individual roll call vote simply in terms of which side might logically be inferred to be in support of, and which side in opposition to, the California Teachers Association.[18]

Our interpretation of the relationship of legislative attitudes expressed in the interview to roll call votes must be qualified in this case by the fact that a relatively high proportion of the members of the California Assembly were not asked the school needs question, and therefore appear in the "not ascertained" category in Table 33. Even bearing this qualification in mind, however, it appears from the data shown in this table that there was a definite positive relationship between attitudes on the problem of school needs as expressed in the interview schedule and the position taken by the legislators in roll call votes on Assembly Bill 3045. In all but one of the seven votes shown in Table 33, legislators with favorable attitudes toward the problem of school needs made up a higher proportion of those who supported the position of the California Teachers Association than of those who voted in opposition. Legislators with unfavorable attitudes made up a higher proportion of those who opposed the CTA than of those who vote with this organization in all but one of the seven votes, and we note that in every one of these votes the neutrals were somewhat more likely to be found opposing, rather than supporting, the CTA position.

Table 33 also shows the vote on Assembly Bill 3046 as an illustration of a case where the results were quite different than those shown in the votes on Assembly Bill 3045. Bill 3046 provided for a cigarette tax to finance Bill 3045, and the vote shown in Table 33 was on a motion to discharge the bill from the Revenue and Taxation Committee. Although the CTA had sponsored this bill, it was not able to mobilize enough support to overcome the traditional legislative reluctance to discharge a committee, and the attitudinal data shown in connection with this vote indicate that a considerable portion of legislators who were generally favorable to education had not been convinced of the need for a cigarette tax. After the 1958 election, however, a similar bill, supported by the CTA, was enacted by the Legislature.

There were eleven bills backed by the New Jersey Education Association on which there were roll call votes in the 1957 session. Most of these bills passed both houses by unanimous votes, and there was only one roll call where more than two votes were recorded in opposition to the NJEA position. This seeming virtual unanimous support of the NJEA gives a somewhat exaggerated picture of the power of this organization in the New Jersey Legislature, for it must be remembered in interpreting the results of these roll call votes that all actions of both houses in New Jersey were controlled by the majority caucuses, and no bill reached the stage of a roll call vote unless it has had prior approval in caucus. In terms of this practical political situation the NJEA, frequently had to modify its proposals in order to get them accepted by the Republican leadership in both the Assembly and the Senate.

Although there was only one roll call in the New Jersey Assembly where there were more than two votes recorded in opposition to the NJEA position, there were two additional votes where a considerable proportion of the members recorded their opposition or indecision by abstaining. Since the New Jersey Constitution requires that, in order to pass, bills must receive a majority of all the members elected, the effect of an abstention is the same as that of a recorded vote in the negative. The votes on the one bill which received more than negligible recorded opposition, and the two bills where there were a significant number of abstentions are shown in Table 34.

The first vote shown in this table was the one on overriding the Governor's veto of Senate Bill 33. This bill exempted certain teachers from any reduction in their pension payments for social security benefit deductions. It orginally passed the Assembly by a vote of 52-1, with two abstentions, and the Senate by a vote of 17-1, with one abstention. The Governor vetoed the bill on the grounds that it would be difficult to administer, and would cost the state too much money, but his veto was overridden in the Senate by a vote of 15-1, with three abstentions. When the motion to override the veto was about to come up in the Assembly the Governor placed considerable pressure on the Democrats to sustain his veto, and the final result was an almost straight party line vote in which the NJEA failed to muster the 40 votes necessary to override the veto. There were only two Democrats who voted to override the veto, and only one Republican who voted to sustain it. Since this vote developed into a clear-cut issue of party politics, we were not surprised to find, as is shown in Table 34, that there was little relation between the voting position taken by the legislators and their general attitudes on the matter of school needs. It should probably be recorded, however, that the two Democrats who voted to override the Governor's veto had both been classified as favorable to education on the basis of their interview remarks, while the one Republican who voted to sustain the veto had been classified as unfavorable.

The second roll call shown in Table 34 was on Assembly Bill 9 which revised the minimum salary schedule for teachers. This bill passed by a vote of 43-0, but there were fourteen abstentions.[19] It can be seen in the table that this group who abstained were much less likely than those who were recorded for the bill to have been classified as favorable to education on the basis of the interview data. Also, in contrast to supporters of the bill, the abstainers included a much higher proportion of members who had been classified as unfavorable.

The third roll call on an NJEA supported bill shown in Table 34 was on Assembly Bill 22 which authorized any school board to require immunization against poliomyelitis as a prerequisite to attendance at school. This bill passed by a vote of 36-2, but there were twenty abstentions. Since the particular issue involved here was not strictly a matter of education, we would not necessarily expect the vote to be related to attitudes expressed in the interview, but we note in the table that those who supported the NJEA position were more likely to be favorable than those who voted no, or abstained. The supporters of the bill also included a relatively high proportion of members who were unfavorable, however, and it is noted that those who voted no, or abstained, included a relatively high proportion of members who were neutral, or whose attitude on the school needs problem was not ascertained.

Table 34

RELATION OF EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES TO NEW JERSEY ASSEMBLY ROLL CALL VOTES

	Attitude Toward Education					
	Favorable	Ambivalent	Unfavorable	Neutral	Not Ascertained	Total
Senate Bill 33 (override veto)						
Supporting NJEA* N=38	45%	21	10	8	16	100%
Opposing NJEA N=18	44%	17	11	22	6	100%
Assembly Bill 9						
Supporting NJEA N=43	53%	21	5	12	9	100%
Abstaining N=14	21%	14	30	14	21	100%
Assembly Bill 22						
Supporting NJEA N=36	50%	20	14	8	8	100%
Opposing NJEA or Abstaining N=22	41%	18	5	18	18	100%

*New Jersey Education Association

According to the officials of the Ohio Education Association, the 1957 session of the Ohio Legislature was not a critical one in so far as education was concerned. This appears to have been mainly due to the fact that a major new state educational financing program had just gone into effect in the fall of 1956, and there was general agreement that new legislation should not be proposed until there had been time to evaluate the new program.

There were, however, two roll call votes in the 1957 session which the Ohio Education Association regarded as important. The first of these was on House Bill 1, which provided for a revision of the law relative to tax levies by political subdivisions in excess of the ten-mill limitation. When this bill first came up for a vote in the Ohio House of Representatives it carried an amendment that would have required tax levies a year in advance, and the Ohio Education Association was strongly opposed to this particular provision. The bill failed to pass on this particular roll call, although later, with the objectionable amendment removed, it passed both the House and Senate with little opposition.

Officials of the Ohio Education Association felt that legislators who voted for House Bill 1 on the first roll call should be regarded as "not friendly to schools", but we note in Table 35 that the group of legislators who supported the OEA on this roll call contained a somewhat smaller proportion of members who were generally favorable to education than the group who opposed the OEA position.[20]

The attitude data shown on this particular roll call appear to give us some reason for doubting the validity of our measure of attitude that was based on legislators discussion of the school needs problem in the interviews. Another possible inference that can be made, however, both from the data shown in Table 35, and the subject matter of the bill (i.e. it applied to political subdivisions generally, not just to school districts), is that the legislators were less likely than the OEA officials to regard this vote either as particularly salient, or as directly concerned with the problem of school needs.

The second roll call vote shown in Table 35 was on House Bill 509 which provided for a permanent tax levy by school boards. This bill was sponsored by the Ohio Education Association and it was clearly connected with the school needs issue. While there was little opposition to this bill in the House (it later died in a Senate Committee), we have shown it in the table, since it provides us with the only other possible test of the relation of our attitude measure to voting behavior in the Ohio Legislature.

The data shown in Table 35 rather clearly suggest that in this case there was a positive relation between attitudes expressed in the legislative interviews and roll call votes in support of, or in opposition to, the OEA position on the bill. On the basis of the interview material those who supported the OEA position were much more likely to have been classified as favorable, and less likely to have been classified as unfavorable, than those who voted in opposition to the bill.

Table 35

RELATION OF EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES TO OHIO HOUSE ROLL CALL VOTES

	Attitude Toward Education					
	Favorable	Ambivalent	Unfavorable	Neutral	Not Ascertained	Total
House Bill 1						
Supporting OEA* N=67	28%	18	24	22	8	100%
Opposing OEA N=39	34%	15	21	15	15	100%
House Bill 509						
Supporting OEA N=76	30%	20	15	22	13	100%
Opposing OEA N=18	11%	17	39	22	11	100%

* Ohio Education Association

Educational politics in the Tennessee Legislature during the 1957 session centered around the General Education Bill sponsored by the administration of Governor Clement. The Tennessee Education Association regarded this bill as inadequate, and efforts were made to have it amended to provide for greater salary increases for teachers. Aided by Republican legislators who were anxious to embarrass the Clement administration, the TEA was able to defeat the administration twice in the House, but it was never able to get its amendment accepted by the Senate.

The critical votes on the General Education Bill in both Houses are shown in Table 36, and we will give a brief chronological description of the legislative situations in which they occurred.[21] When the bill came up in the Senate on February 6, the TEA amendment was proposed on the floor, but a motion to table it was carried by a vote of 21-11 (Senate Vote 1 in Table 36). The Senate then passed the bill, and when the measure came up in the House on February 8, the supporters of the TEA succeeded in getting their amendment adopted by a vote of 50-46 (House Vote

2

1 in Table 36). The amended bill was then passed by the House, but when it was returned to the Senate on February 12, that body refused to concur in the House action by a vote of 21-12 (Senate Vote 2 in Table 36). On the same day the House voted 50-49 not to recede from its previous action (House Vote 2 in Table 36).

Table 36

RELATION OF EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES TO TENNESSEE LEGISLATURE ROLL CALL VOTES

	Attitude Toward Education					
	Favorable	Ambivalent	Unfavorable	Neutral	Not Ascertained	Total
Senate Vote 1						
Supporting TEA* N=11	46%	27	9	-	18	100%
Opposing TEA N=21	33%	19	10	24	14	100%
Senate Vote 2						
Supporting TEA N=12	50%	25	8	-	17	100%
Opposing TEA N=21	33%	19	10	24	14	100%
Senate Vote 3						
Supporting TEA N=10	40%	30	10	-	20	100%
Opposing TEA N=22	36%	18	9	23	14	100%
House Vote 1						
Supporting TEA N=50	42%	14	12	16	16	100%
Opposing TEA N=46	33%	17	30	9	11	100%
House Vote 2						
Supporting TEA N=50	42%	14	14	14	16	100%
Opposing TEA N=49	33%	16	29	10	12	100%
House Vote 3						
Supporting TEA N=43	47%	14	9	16	14	100%
Opposing TEA N=56	30%	16	30	9	15	100%

*Tennessee Education Association

A conference committee was then appointed, and on February 18 a majority report of this committee recommended approval of the Governor's version of the bill, but there was also a minority report which recommended a modified TEA sponsored amendment providing for greater salary increases. When the majority report was presented in the Senate on February 20, an attempt was made to substitute the minority report, but a motion to table this proposal was carried by a vote of 22-10 (Senate Vote 3 in Table 36). On the same day a similar attempt was made to substitute the minority report for the majority report in the House, but a motion to table this proposal was carried by a vote of 55-43 (House Vote 3 in Table 36). The House then adopted the Senate (and administration approved) version of the bill by a vote of 91-2.

These Tennessee data give us the best verification of our original hypothesis that the measure of attitude toward education developed from the interview replies would be related to roll call votes on educational bills in the legislature. It can be seen in Table 36 that in each of the six critical votes on the General Education Bill those who supported the TEA position included a higher proportion of favorable legislators than those who were opposed to the TEA position. We also note that in the House votes the legislators who made only unfavorable comments in the interview made up a relatively smaller proportion of those who supported the TEA position. In the Senate, however, there were approximately equal proportions of unfavorable legislators in the supporting and opposing groups, while all of the neutrals consistently supported the administration and voted against the TEA.

In summary, it appears that we can say that the data for California and Tennessee shown in Tables 33 and 36 give considerable support to the hypothesis that legislators' attitudes measured by their interview discussion of the school needs problem would be related to their roll call votes on educational bills. The data for New Jersey (Table 34) also give some support to the hypothesis, in spite of the fact that it was difficult to adequately test it in that state because of the fact that there was so little opposition to education recorded in roll call votes. In the case of Ohio, it was difficult to test the hypothesis because there were no really critical educational votes in the session that we studied. Of the two roll calls used to test the hypothesis in Ohio (Table 35), one gave some evidence for negating the hypothesis while the other appeared to support it. In the first case the apparent negation of the hypothesis may be partially explained by inferring from the subject matter of the bill that it was not regarded by the legislators as directly connected to the school needs problem. In the latter case, on the other hand, the apparent confirmation of the hypothesis must be accepted cautiously because the vote was rather one-sided.

Part V

CORRELATES OF ATTITUDE TOWARD EDUCATION

The purpose of this section of the report is to discuss some of the correlates of the measure of attitude toward education which was first presented in Part I and used as interpretive variable throughout the report. In spite of the fact that this was a very crude attitudinal measure, it proved to be of considerable value in analyzing the legislators replies to several of the questions on the school needs issue, and we have also shown in Part IV that there was some relation between the attitudes indicated by this measure and the votes of the legislators as recorded in the legislative journals.

This led us to believe that it would be desirable to try to determine some of the independent variables that were related to educational attitude. This was made possible by the fact that we had already assembled a considerable amount of data on the personal, social, economic, and ideological characteristics of each individual legislator in the study.

Age

In Tables 37 through 43, we have shown some of these independent variables that appeared to have some relation to the attitude expressed toward education in the legislators' replies to question 31. The first of these that was considered was age. We had no very strong expectation that this variable would be related to educational attitude, but it did appear plausible to expect that younger legislators, who might be more likely to have children in school, would be favorable to educational expansion. This expectation was borne out, however, in only one of the states, New Jersey, where legislators over 45 were rather clearly *less* likely than younger members to be favorable. In Ohio and Tennessee, however, Table 37 shows that the legislators who were over 45 were *more* likely to be found in the favorable category. There were equal proportions of older and younger members in the favorable category in California, but the younger Californians had a higher percentage in the unfavorable category. We are at a loss to explain these interstate differences, or, for that matter, the fact that there should be *any* relation between age and attitude toward education, except, as is indicated below that legislative tenure and experience did have some relation to attitude.

Table 37

RELATION OF AGE TO LEGISLATORS' ATTITUDE TOWARD EDUCATION

	Attitude Toward Education				
Age	Favorable	Ambivalent	Unfavorable	Neutral	Total
Four state total					
40 and under (N=128)	37%	23	20	20	100%
41-55 (N=181)	47%	20	18	15	100%
Over 55 (N=108)	49%	12	19	20	100%
California					
45 and under (N=30)	66%	10	17	7	100%
Over 45 (N=49)	66%	12	10	12	100%
New Jersey					
45 and under (N=35)	63%	20	6	11	100%
Over 45 (N=36)	45%	22	11	22	100%
Ohio					
45 and under (N=68)	24%	29	21	26	100%
Over 45 (N=87)	34%	14	28	24	100%
Tennessee					
45 and under (N=60)	33%	22	27	18	100%
Over 45 (N=52)	56%	17	15	12	100%

Education

The legislators in our study were a quite highly educated group compared to the total population, and since most of them had had at least some college training, the only very meaningful way of classifying them according to education was by dividing them into those who were college graduates and those whose education had not reached that level. We had expected that the college graduates would be more aware of the advantages of education and thus more likely to be favorable on the school needs issue. The data shown in Table 38, however, indicate that in Ohio and Tennessee the college graduates were considerably less likely than those with less education to be found in the favorable category. The relation between amount of education and attitude on the school needs issue is less apparent in California and New Jersey, but it appears that in the former state the college graduates were more likely to be ambivalent, and in the latter state they were more likely to be either ambivalent or unfavorable and less likely to be neutral. These data force us to revise our original hypothesis and come to the tentative conclusion that legislators who have had less educational opportunity are more likely than those who were college graduates to be favorable in their attitudes on the issue of school needs. Although the proportion of legislators who had not been to college at all was too small to make possible a very conclusive analysis, the data suggested that this group was even more likely to have a favorable attitude on school needs than those who had been to college but had not graduated.[22]

Table 38

RELATION OF AMOUNT OF EDUCATION TO LEGISLATOR'S ATTITUDE TOWARD EDUCATION

	Attitude Toward Education				
Amount of Education	Favorable	Ambivalent	Unfavorable	Neutral	Total
Four state total					
Less than completed college (N=171)	50%	16	16	18	100%
College graduate (N=247)	41%	20	21	18	100%
California					
Less than completed college (N=31)	68%	6	16	10	100%
College graduate (N=48)	65%	15	10	10	100%
New Jersey					
Less than completed college (N=19)	53%	16	5	26	100%
College graduate (N=52)	54%	23	10	13	100%
Ohio					
Less than completed college (N=63)	36%	19	21	24	100%
College graduate (N=92)	25%	22	27	26	100%
Tennessee					
Less than completed college (N=58)	53%	19	14	14	100%
College graduate (N=55)	35%	20	29	16	100%

Occupation

There were not enough legislators in any single occupation except law to make a meaningful analysis within each individual state on any other basis except a comparison of law and all other occupations. We had expected that, because of the rigorous educational requirements of their profession, lawyers might be more likely to be favorable to education than other occupations, but this proved to be the case only in New Jersey. Lawyer-legislators in California were only slightly more likely than other California lawmakers to take a favorable position, and in both Ohio and Tennessee the lawyers were definitely less likely than other occupational groups to be found in the favorable category. We have presented the attitude data for each state in Table 39 for law, business, and other occupations, but we are not encouraged to do very much in the way of generalizing about the difference in educational attitude between law and business when we note in the four state total that there were quite wide differences among the various specific business occupations in their attitudes on the school needs issue. These four state totals show that legislators in the transportation and communication industry were much more likely to be favorable to education than those who were in banking, insurance, and real estate.

Table 39

RELATION OF OCCUPATION TO LEGISLATORS' ATTITUDE TOWARD EDUCATION

	Attitude Toward Education				
Occupation	Favorable	Ambivalent	Unfavorable	Neutral	Total
Four state total					
Agricultural (N=49)	47%	14	20	19	100%
Wholesale & retail trade (N=46)	54%	20	13	13	100%
Banking, insurance, real estate (N=40)	40%	15	25	20	100%
Transportation & communication (N=21)	57%	19	14	10	100%
Other business occupations (N=47)	38%	17	19	26	100%
Law (N=158)	41%	20	19	20	100%
Other professions (N=30)	54%	23	20	3	100%
All other occupations (N=27)	44%	19	15	22	100%
California					
Business (N=27)	59%	---	30	11	100%
Law (N=25)	68%	20	4	8	100%
Other occupations (N=27)	70%	15	4	11	100%
New Jersey					
Business (N=17)	41%	29	12	18	100%
Law (N=39)	61%	18	8	13	100%
Other occupations (N=15)	47%	20	6	27	100%
Ohio					
Business (N=61)	39%	18	15	28	100%
Law (N=57)	25%	30	25	20	100%
Other occupations (N=37)	22%	24	41	13	100%
Tennessee					
Business (N=49)	49%	22	18	11	100%
Law (N=37)	24%	22	32	22	100%
Other occupations (N=27)	63%	11	11	15	100%

Although there were not enough agricultural legislators in any single state to make a very meaningful analysis of their educational attitudes, the data suggested that this occupational group was more likely to be favorable than unfavorable to education in California and Tennessee, but that the reverse held true in Ohio. In short, we are forced to conclude that, if there is any relation between occupation and legislative attitude on the issue of school needs, this relation is likely to vary considerably with the individual state situation.

Table 40

RELATION OF PLACE OF RESIDENCE TO ATTITUDE TOWARD EDUCATION

	Attitude Toward Education				
Urban-Rural Nature of County of Residence	Favorable	Ambivalent	Unfavorable	Neutral	Total
Four state total (N=418)					
Metropolitan areas (N=207)	44%	16	18	22	100%
Non-metropolitan areas					
Less than 30% rural-farm (N=110)	53%	20	12	15	100%
30% to 49% rural-farm (N=44)	23%	25	38	14	100%
50% or more rural-farm (N=57)	46%	20	20	14	100%
California					
Metropolitan areas (N=49)	63%	10	19	8	100%
Non-metropolitan areas (N=30)	70%	13	4	13	100%
New Jersey					
Metropolitan areas (N=57)	53%	19	9	19	100%
Non-metropolitan areas (N=14)	57%	29	7	7	100%
Ohio					
Metropolitan areas (N=75)	27%	19	23	31	100%
Non-metropolitan areas					
Less than 30% rural-farm (N=51)	41%	19	18	22	100%
30% or more rural-farm (N=29)	17%	28	38	17	100%
Tennessee					
Metropolitan areas (N=26)	42%	12	19	27	100%
Non-metropolitan areas					
Less than 50% rural-farm (N=43)	33%	25	33	9	100%
50% or more rural-farm (N=44)	57%	18	11	14	100%

Urban-Rural Nature of Home County

Table 40 shows the relation of the nature of the county in which the legislators resided to attitudes on the school needs issue. In this case we had expected that legislators who lived in counties located in metropolitan areas might be less sensitive to the problem because of the fact that the issue of school needs appears to be somewhat less critical in large urban centers than in rural sections of the country. This tentative hypothesis was given some support by the data shown in Table 40, for it can be seen that in each of the four states the legislators who lived in metropolitan areas were somewhat less likely to have a favorable attitude to education than those who lived elsewhere.

There were not enough legislators who lived outside metropolitan areas in California and New Jersey to do a further analysis in those states, but when we divided the non-metropolitan Tennessee and Ohio legislators according to the percentage of rural-farm population in their home counties the results, as shown in Table 40, were quite different. In Tennessee the legislators who came from non-metropolitan areas with less than 50% rural-farm population were even less likely to be favorable (and more likely to be unfavorable) than those who resided in metropolitan areas. The legislators from the "most rural" (50% of more rural-farm) areas of Tennessee, however, were much more likely than other members to take a favorable position on the school needs issue.

Since Ohio was relatively "less rural" than Tennessee, it was necessary to use a different breaking point for analysis purposes in that state, but the data rather clearly show that, in contrast to Tennessee, the Ohio lawmakers from the "most rural" counties (30% or more rural-farm) were considerably less likely to be favorable (and more likely to be unfavorable) than other members. This difference between Tennessee and Ohio is consistent with the previously noted tendency for agricultural legislators to be more favorable in the former state and less so in the latter.

Table 41

RELATION OF IDEOLOGY TO LEGISLATORS' ATTITUDE TOWARD EDUCATION

	Attitude Toward Education				
Ideology	Favorable	Ambivalent	Unfavorable	Neutral	Total
Four state total					
Liberals (N=248)	50%	18	14	18	100%
Conservatives (N=166)	35%	20	27	18	100%
California					
Liberals (N=58)	67%	14	9	10	100%
Conservatives (N=20)	60%	5	25	10	100%
New Jersey					
Liberals (N=44)	59%	16	9	16	100%
Conservatives (N=27)	44%	30	7	19	100%
Ohio					
Liberals (N=78)	38%	20	16	26	100%
Conservatives (N=76)	20%	22	33	25	100%
Tennessee					
Liberals (N=68)	44%	20	18	18	100%
Conservatives (N=43)	44%	19	28	9	100%

Ideology

On the basis of their responses to a three item "ideology scale" it was possible to divide the legislators into two categories that we labeled "Liberals" and "Conservatives".[23] Our measure was a rather crude one, and there is a serious possibility of terminological confusion in trying to interpret it, but for whatever they may be worth we have presented the data in Table 41 which show that in three of the four states in the study the "Liberal" legislators were more likely than the "Conservatives" to take a favorable position. In Tennessee the Liberal and Conservative groups contained equal proportions of legislators favorable to education, but the Conservatives were more likely to be unfavorable, while the Liberals were more likely to be ambivalent or neutral.

Table 42

RELATION OF PARTY TO LEGISLATORS' ATTITUDE TOWARD EDUCATION

	Attitude Toward Education				
Party	Favorable	Ambivalent	Unfavorable	Neutral	Total
Four state total					
Democrats (N=203)	50%	18	18	14	100%
Republicans (N=215)	40%	19	19	22	100%
California					
Democrats (N=38)	76%	16	5	3	100%
Republicans (N-41)	56%	7	20	17	100%
New Jersey					
Democrats (N=25)	56%	16	8	20	100%
Republicans (N=46)	52%	24	9	15	100%
Ohio					
Democrats (N=49)	43%	20	20	17	100%
Republicans (N=106)	24%	21	26	29	100%
Tennessee					
Democrats (N=91)	41%	18	25	16	100%
Republicans (N=22)	59%	27	5	9	100%
Party Orientation					
Democrats					
Weak (N=69)	48%	13	23	16	100%
Moderate (N=53)	51%	21	15	13	100%
Regular (N-71)	52%	21	14	13	100%
Republicans					
Weak (N=51)	53%	21	10	16	100%
Moderate (N=48)	39%	19	21	21	100%
Regular (N=114)	33%	19	22	26	100%

Party

It will be recalled from the discussion of Table 24 that most of the legislators did not perceive any differences between legislative members of the two major political parties on the school needs issue. Our analysis indicates, however, that there were differences between Republicans and Democrats in the attitudes they expressed in discussing this issue. Table 42 shows that Democrats were slightly more likely to be favorable to education in New Jersey, and much more likely to express a favorable attitude in the states of California and Ohio. In Tennessee, on the other hand, it appears that the Republicans were more likely than the Democrats to take a favorable position on the school needs issue.

Table 42 also gives an indication of the relation of the legislators' party orientations to their educational attitudes. It will be recalled that party orientation was previously discussed in connection with Table 20. In this case the data indicate that the "Regular" Democrats were more likely than Democrats with a "Weak" party orientation to take a favorable position. In the Republican Party, however, it was the Weak Party Men who were more likely to be favorable, while the Regular Republicans were more likely to take an unfavorable position on the school needs issue. This appears to substantiate the finding that educational attitude is related to ideology, ranging the members from conservative to liberal.

Table 43

RELATION OF LEGISLATIVE EXPERIENCE TO LEGISLATORS' ATTITUDE TOWARD EDUCATION

	Attitude Toward Education				
Experience in the Legislature	Favorable	Ambivalent	Unfavorable	Neutral	Total
California					
Five years or less (N=42)	62%	17	12	9	100%
Over five years (N=37)	70%	5	14	11	100%
New Jersey					
Three years or less (N=38)	50%	24	8	18	100%
Over three years (N=33)	58%	18	9	15	100%
Ohio					
Four years or less (N=82)	26%	21	26	27	100%
Over four years (N=73)	35%	19	23	23	100%
Tennessee					
No previous experience (N=50)	42%	24	16	18	100%
Two or more years (N=63)	46%	16	25	13	100%

Legislative Experience

There was considerable variation in the tenure and turnover of the four legislatures in our study, and for this reason we have shown the data on legislative experience in Table 43 with the legislators in each state divided into those with more and those with less than the median number of years of legislative experience. In the case of Tennessee there was such a high proportion of new members in the legislature, that the only meaningful way of dividing them was into those who had any prior service and those who were serving their first terms.

We had expected that the members with longer experience in trying to deal with the problem might be more likely than those with less experience to take a favorable position on the school needs issue. While the differences are not large, this is shown to be the case in all four of the states. It should be pointed out, however, that in most cases the legislators with less experience were more likely to be ambivalent or neutral rather than unfavorably inclined on the school needs issue.

Unrelated Variables

In concluding this section it seems appropriate to mention some of the variables that were shown not to be related to attitude on the school needs issue, according to our analysis. Among the variables tested and found to have no such relation were income, previous governmental experience, and place of upbringing. Educational attitudes were also found to be unrelated to representational roles, interest group roles, and state-district orientation. There was a suggestion in the data that Catholic legislators in New Jersey might be less likely than other members to be favorable, and more likely to be neutral, on the school needs issue, but there was definitely no relation between religion and educational attitude in Ohio, and in California out of nine Catholic legislators interviewed, eight expressed entirely favorable attitudes and one was ambivalent.

SUMMARY

Most of the data in this report were gathered by participants in the State Legislative Research Project in personal interviews with legislators in the states of California, New Jersey, Ohio, and Tennessee. The interviews were conducted during the 1957 sessions of the four legislatures, and the total number of legislators who gave their views on the problem of school needs was 422. This constituted 84% of the total membership of the four legislatures.

When asked to describe their own personal solutions to the problem of school needs, most of the legislators discussed the problem primarily in terms of finance. More than one-half of them mentioned only finances, but about one-third suggested administrative solutions, and a few were concerned with curriculum problems. California legislators were more likely than those in the other states to discuss the problem exclusively in financial terms, and Ohio legislators were more likely to mention administrative solutions.

Legislators who had been identified as educational experts by their fellow members were more likely than other members to mention both financial and administrative, or financial and curriculum solutions, or a combination of all three.

With regard to sources of funds, a considerably higher proportion of New Jersey legislators was willing to propose new taxes than in any of the other states. State aid was much more likely to be mentioned in California than in the other four states, and, while Tennessee legislators were less likely than those in the other states to suggest new taxes, they were second only to California in the likelihood of suggesting state aid.

With regard to allocation of funds, more than one-fourth of the lawmakers advocated providing more money for teacher salaries. In comparison with the other states, Ohio legislators were somewhat less likely, and Tennesseeans much more likely to suggest the need for higher salaries.

Ohio legislators were more likely than those in the other states to indicate the desirability of administrative economy and school district consolidation, while New Jersey lawmakers were more likely to mention a need for standardization and economy in school construction.

On the basis of the solution that he proposed for the school needs problem, each of the legislators was classified as either favorable, ambivalent, unfavorable, or neutral in his general attitude toward education. This measure of attitude was used as an interpretive variable throughout the report. Since most of the legislators discussed the problem primarily in terms of finance, a "favorable" legislator means, for the most part, one who advocated more money for schools, while those in the "unfavorable" category were, for the most part, advocates of economy.

Of the entire group of legislators interviewed, almost one-half gave replies that were entirely favorable to education, and the remainder were divided into three groups (ambivalent, unfavorable, and neutral) of approximately equal size. Ohio legislators were much less likely, and California legislators more likely, than those in the other states to express only favorable attitudes toward education. Ohio and Tennessee had higher proportions in the unfavorable category than California and New Jersey. Legislative educational experts were more likely than other members to be favorable or ambivalent in attitude and less likely to be unfavorable or neutral.

When asked what they had done, or expected to do, to promote the solution for the school needs problem that they favored, 70% of the legislators interviewed reported at least one action, over one-half of them mentioned more than one action, and one-third mentioned three or more. Legislators who were favorable or ambivalent toward education reported more activity than those who were unfavorable, and, not surprisingly, the least amount of activity was reported by the neutrals. Educational experts reported much more activity than other members.

When the legislators were asked what sources of advice and information they trusted most on the subject of school needs, the sources most frequently mentioned were state and local school officials and the educational associations, but there were some important differences among the four states in the proportions who mentioned the various sources. In Ohio the legislators were more likely to mention state and local school officials as a trusted source, while in New Jersey they were more likely to mention the state education association. Ohio legislators were also more likely to say that they got reliable information from fellow members of the legislature and legislative service agencies. State agencies or officials other than those directly connected with education were more likely to be mentioned as a trusted source of information in Tennessee than in the other three states.

Legislators who were favorable in their attitude toward education were more likely than those in other attitude categories to mention the educational associations as a reliable source of advice, and legislators who said that they got their most reliable information from local school officials were less likely to be favorable to education than those who looked for information to state school officials. Educational experts in the legislature were more likely than other members to say that they got reliable information from the education associations and state school officials, and less likely than other members to mention local school officials.

Legislators who assumed the representational role of Trustee were more likely than those who assumed the role of Delegate to say that they got reliable advice from the educational associations. Those who assumed the Delegate role were more likely to mention teachers and educators, and those who were classified as Politicos were more likely to say that they relied on the advice of fellow members of the legislature.

In order to get a more precise picture of the relative importance of various factors that had influenced the legislators' thinking on educational matters they were asked to rank the following items: a. views of friends in the legislature; b. advice of party leaders; c. word from people in your district; d. report of Legislative Commission or Legislative Council; e. committee recommendation; f. views of administrative agencies; g. views of interest groups or lobbies; h. other (specify). In each of the states the item which received the highest ranking was "word from people in your district", but New Jersey legislators were somewhat less likely to give this item the highest ranking than legislators in the other states. New Jersey lawmakers also differed from those in the other states in giving a much higher ranking to the views of interest groups or lobbies, and there was also a high proportion of New Jersey members who said that their views on the school needs problem were more the result of their own personal experience, study, or observations, than of any of the items on the list that they had been given for ranking purposes. Most of the legislators gave a very low ranking to the advice of party leaders and Californians were even more likely than those in the other states to take this position.

In contrast to those who were unfavorable or neutral, those who were favorable or ambivalent in their attitude toward education gave a relatively high rating to the views of interest groups or lobbies. Those who were neutral in attitude were less likely than other members to say that word from people in their districts had ranked high as an influence on their views. Both the ambivalents and the neutrals were more likely than those who took a position either pro or con to give a low rating to the influence of the views of fellow members of the legislature.

Legislators who assumed the representational role of Delegate were more likely than those classified as Trustees to give a high rating to word from people in their districts. The Trustees were much more likely than the other representational role types to give the lowest ranking to the views of interest groups or lobbies. "District-oriented" legislators were more likely than those who were "State-oriented" to give a high ranking to word from people in their districts, and those who were "State-oriented" were more likely to give a high ranking to the views of friends in the legislature.

Legislators who assumed the group role of Facilitater were more likely than those who assumed the group role of Resister to say that the views of interest groups or lobbies had been important in determing their views on the matter of school needs. In terms of their general orientation toward political parties, the "Regular Party Men" were more likely than the "Weak Party Men" to say that the advice of party leaders had been an important influence on their views.

After the legislators had presented their own solutions to the school needs problem, they were asked several questions regarding the attitudes on this matter of people in their districts, fellow members of the legislature, and interest groups or lobbies. New Jersey and Tennessee legislators reported many more contacts from constituents than those in the other two states, and there was also a considerable difference between California and Ohio in number of contacts reported, with the latter state having the largest proportion (over one-third) who said that they had had no contacts whatever from constituents with regard to the matter of school needs.

It was found that there was a rather marked relation between number of contacts from constituents and attitude toward education. In each of the states, those who reported more than 35 contacts were more likely to be favorable to education than those who reported fewer contacts. Also, in each of the states, the legislators who were unfavorable to education included the highest proportion who reported no contacts whatever from constituents.

When asked what kind of people had contacted them, two-thirds of the Tennessee lawmakers and more than one-half of those in New Jersey reported contacts from teachers and teacher organizations, but there was a somewhat smaller proportion of teacher contacts in California, and in Ohio only one-fifth of the legislators said that they had heard from teachers or teacher organizations. In contrast, the Ohioans were somewhat more likely to say that they had been contacted by school administrators or board members. Contacts from Parent Teacher Associations and other parent groups were considerably more likely to be mentioned in New Jersey than in the other states, and, in this case, too, the smallest percentage of contacts was reported in Ohio.

Legislators favorable to education were considerably more likely than those in the other attitude categories to say that they had been contacted by teachers or parent groups, but there was no difference in the proportions of favorable and unfavorable legislators who reported contacts from school officials or board members.

A majority of the legislators in each of the four states felt that most of their constituents agreed with their positions on the school needs problem, but legislators who were unfavorable to education were somewhat more likely than those in the other attitude categories to perceive themselves in disagreement with their constituents.

When asked to describe the educational views of fellow members of the legislature, a majority of those interviewed in each state indicated that there were no differences between legislative members of the two major political parties. A majority of those interviewed in California and New Jersey also saw no differences between rural and urban members on the school needs matter, but in Ohio and Tennessee there were relatively larger proportions who indicated that rural and urban members differed in their solutions for the problem.

A different approach to the problem of conflicting attitudes on the matter of school needs was obtained by asking the legislators to rank order a series of possible opinion conflicts among legislative members on the school needs issue. The list of conflicts of opinion presented to the legislators was as follows: a. Republicans vs. Democrats; b. Governor's supporters vs. opponents; c. cities vs. rural counties; d. liberals vs. conservatives; e. labor vs. opponents of labor; f. geographical conflicts. A relatively high proportion of the legislators said that none of the listed conflicts of opinion were important in the legislature with reference to the school needs issue. Such an attitude was much more prevalent in New Jersey and somewhat more noticable in California than in the other two states. Very few of the legislators in any of the states gave a high ranking to conflict between Republicans and Democrats, but a relatively high proportion gave a high ranking to conflict of opinion between rural and urban members, and this latter conflict was even more salient in Ohio than in the other three states. Tennessee lawmakers were much more likely than those in the other states to give a high ranking to conflict between supporters and opponents of the Governor, and Californians were more likely than those in other states to give a high rating to liberal-conservative conflict, as well as that between labor and its opponents.

There were several questions in the interview schedule dealing with interest groups or lobbies, and this gave an opportunity to compare the legislators' perceptions of educational interests with their perceptions of other interests in their states. When the legislators were asked to name the most powerful groups or lobbies in their states, educational interests were ranked second only to business interests in all four of the states. This was a rather "poor second", however, particularly in Ohio, where educational interests were only slightly more likely than agriculture and labor to be mentioned as among the most powerful. When the lawmakers were asked which groups or interests were particularly strong in their own districts, educational interests were the ones most frequently mentioned in every state but Ohio, but when they were asked which groups or interests were particularly worth listening to, whether or not they were powerful, educational interests fared rather poorly in all four of the states. Particularly in comparison with business, the advice of educational interests was not likely to be very highly regarded in any of the four states.

Turning from general classes of interest groups to specific organizations, it was found that, while business interests in general were regarded as more powerful than educational interests, there was no specific business group in any of the four states that was mentioned as frequently, in the context of power, as the state education association. In California, New Jersey, and Tennessee, the legislators also ranked the education associations first in terms of power in their constituencies, but in Ohio they were much more likely to mention the Farm Bureau and somewhat more likely to mention the Grange and the Chamber of Commerce when they were asked what groups were particularly strong in their own districts. In the context of group merit the Tennessee Education Association was mentioned more frequently than any other specific organization in that state, but in the other three states the education associations were far down the list in terms of the likelihood of being mentioned as a group whose advice ought to be considered, whether or not it happened to be powerful.

In the specific context of the school needs issue, educational interests were, of course, mentioned more frequently than any other class of interest. Legislators who were generally favorable to education were likely to see themselves in agreement with educational interests and in disagreement with business interests, while the reverse held true for those who were classified as unfavorable to education. A similar consistency was shown in the legislators' perceptions of the positions of governmental interests (in agreement with unfavorable legislators) and labor interests (in agreement with favorable legislators), although these latter two classes of interest were considerably less salient than educational or business interests in the legislators' discussion of the school needs issue. There were some interstate differences in the perception of the position of business interests, with Ohio legislators more likely, and Tennesseeans less likely, to perceive business interests in disagreement with a favorable attitude toward education.

As a supplement to the data obtained in the interviews with legislators, the writer revisited each of the four states in 1959-60 for interviews with lobbyists of the state educational associations. The lobbyists were asked to indicate which bills had been of major concern to them during the 1957 session, and which legislators they regarded as particularly friendly or particularly unfriendly to education. It was not possible to show a very close relationship between legislative attitudes and the likelihood of being mentioned by lobbyists as friendly or unfriendly to education, but this may have been due to the fact that the lobbyists tended to identify the friendly and unfriendly legislators in terms of specific bills that were important during the session, while the attitude measure was based on the legislator's general perception of the school needs problem.

It was also possible to do a limited amount of analysis of the relation of legislators' attitudes to the voting records on educational bills during the 1957 session. The data for California and Tennessee gave considerable support to the hypothesis that legislators who were classified as favorable to education on the basis of their interview remarks would be more likely than those who were unfavorable, to cast votes in support of the position of the state education association on legislative roll calls. The data for New Jersey also gave some support to this hypothesis, in spite of the fact that it was difficult to adequately test it in that state because there was so little opposition to education recorded in roll call votes. There were no very important votes on educational matters in Ohio during the 1957 session, and,of the two roll calls available for testing the hypothesis in that state, one gave some evidence for negating it, while the other appeared to support it.

Since the measure of attitude based on the legislators' interview remarks proved to be of some considerable value in interpreting the other data in the report, it seemed desirable to try to determine some of the independent variables that were related to legislators' attitudes toward education.

With regard to age it was found that in Ohio and Tennessee the legislators who were over 45 were more likely than younger members to have a favorable attitude. There was little relation between age and attitude in California, but in New Jersey the members who were under 45 were more likely to be favorable in attitude, while older members were more likely to be unfavorable or neutral.

In Ohio and Tennessee, legislators who were college graduates were considerably less likely than those with a smaller amount of education to express an entirely favorable attitude toward education. The relation between amount of education and attitude toward education was less obvious in California and New Jersey, but it appeared that in the former state the college graduates were more likely to be ambivalent than those with less education, and in the latter state, they were more likely to be either ambivalent or unfavorable and less likely to be neutral. The data suggested that the relatively small proportion of the legislators who had not been to college at all were even more likely to be favorable in attitude toward education than those who had been to college, but had not graduated.

The relation between occupation and attitude toward education appeared to vary with the individual state situation. Lawyers were much more likely to be favorable than other occupational groups in the New Jersey Legislature, and there was a slight difference in the same direction in California. In Ohio and Tennessee, however, the lawyers were definitely less likely than those in other occupations to be found in the favorable category. The data indicated that legislators in business occupations were somewhat more likely to be favorable in Ohio, for the total group of legislators in the four states there was wide variation in attitude among specific business occupations. For example, legislators in the transportation and communication industries were much more likely to be favorable than those who were in banking, real estate, and insurance. The data suggested that legislators in agricultural occupations were more likely to be favorable to education in California and Tennessee, but more likely to be unfavorable in Ohio.

In each of the four states, legislators who lived in metropolitan areas were somewhat less likely to be favorable in attitude toward education than those who resided in other areas of the state. There were not enough legislators who lived outside metropolitan areas in California and New Jersey to do a further analysis, but in Tennessee, the legislators who came from the most rural areas (50% or more rural-farm population) were much more likely than other members to take a favorable position on the school needs issue. In Ohio, however, the legislators from the most rural areas (30% or more rural-farm population) were considerably less likely to be favorable and more likely to be unfavorable than other members.

On the basis of their responses to a three item "ideology scale" the legislators were divided into two categories labeled "Liberals" and "Conservatives". In California, New Jersey, and Ohio, the "Liberal" legislators were more likely than the "Conservatives" to express a favorable attitude toward education. In Tennessee, the Liberal and Conservative groups contained equal proportions of legislators favorable to education, but the Conservatives were more likely to be unfavorable, while the Liberals were more likely to be ambivalent or neutral.

Democrats were slightly more likely than Republicans to be favorable to education in New Jersey and Democrats were much more likely to express a favorable attitude in California and Ohio. In Tennessee, however, the Republicans were more likely than the Democrats to take a favorable position on the school needs issue. In terms of their general party orientation the "Regular" Democrats were more likely than Democrats with a "Weak" party orientation to take a favorable position. In the Republican Party, however, it was the "Weak Party Men" who were more likely to be favorable to education, while the "Regulars" were more likely to be unfavorable.

Legislators with longer years of experience in the legislature were more likely to be favorable to education than those who had less experience. But in most cases, the legislators with less experience tended to be ambivalent or neutral, rather than unfavorable in their discussion of the school needs issue.

Among the variables tested and found to have no relation to attitude toward education were, income, religion, previous governmental experience, and place of upbringing.

FOOTNOTES

1. Thomas H. Eliot, "Toward an Understanding of Public School Politics", *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. LIII, No. 4, (December, 1959), pp. 1035-36.

2. *Ibid.* Eliot cites the following "honorable exceptions" to the general neglect of school politics by political scientists: John A. Vieg, *The Government of Education in Metropolitan Chicago* (Chicago, 1939); Robert L. Morlan, *Intergovernmental Relations in Education*, (Minneapolis, 1950); and Nelson B. Henry and Jerome G. Kerwin, *Schools and City Government* (Chicago, 1938). To this list might be added the following publications based on research in which political scientists participated: Howard A. Dawson, Floyd W. Reeves, *et al.*, *Your School District: The Report of the National Commission on School District Reorganization*, (Washington, D.C., 1948). Lyman A. Glenny, *Autonomy of Public Colleges*, (New York, 1959). Malcolm Moos and Francis E. Rourke, *The Campus and the State*, (Baltimore, 1959). Rae Files Still, *The Gilmer-Aiken Bills, A Study in the Legislative Process*, (Austin, Texas, 1950), a detailed case study of the legislative history of three educational bills in the Texas Legislature by a political scientist-legislator. For a general descriptive account of state organization and control of education see Fred Beach and Will Robb, *State and Education*, (Office of Education, Miscellaneous Report No. 23, Washington, D.C., 1958).

3. Eliot cites, among others, the following local or district studies: Vincent Ostrom, "School Board Politics in Los Angeles," unpublished thesis, University of California, Los Angeles, 1948; Leo A. Haak, "The General Public and the Public Schools", in the Midwest Administration Center's *Administrator's Notebook*, Vol. IV, No. 8 (University of Chicago, May, 1957); Chilton R. Bush and Paul J. Deutschmann, "The Inter-Relationships of Attitudes Toward Schools and Voting Behavior in a School Board Election", dittoed report to the Pacific Southwest Project of the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (Stanford University, 1955); Neal Gross, *Who Runs Our Schools?* (New York, 1958); and he also mentions unpublished studies that have been made by himself and Robert H. Salisbury in St. Louis, and by a group including J. Leiper Freeman in "Bay City", Massachusetts. On the state level Eliot lists the following unpublished doctoral dissertations: T. F. Armstrong, Jr., "The Public Educational Programs of Selected Lay Organizations in Pennsylvania", Temple University (1947); C. A. Sommer, "The Attitudes of Organized Farm Groups Toward Education in Michigan", University of Michigan (1953); George A. Male, "The Michigan Education Association as a Pressure Group", University of Michigan (1950). Attention should also be called to another doctoral dissertation by Arthur F. Corey, "State Education Associations and Legislatures", University of Southern California (1956). A mimeographed summary of Dr. Corey's findings and conclusions has been prepared for distribution by the California Teachers Association.

4. *Op. cit.*, p. 1051.

5. This study eventually came to be known as the State Legislative Research Project. Other participants have been indicated on the title page of this report. It is expected that the major report of the project will be published in 1961. Other purblications resulting from the project are cited at appropriate places in this report.

6. Because of problems connected with determining the nature of the sample, and additional difficulties involved in the quantitative analysis of data obtained from open-ended questions, we have not reported statistical significance in discussion of the differences mentioned in this report. It will be obvious to anyone familiar with statistical techniques that many of the differences reported are significant at the .05 level of probability, but we feel that to report the results of statistical tests would be misleading in view of the nature of the sample and the questionnaire. In a number of cases it appears that relatively small differences may be quite significant as suggestions for future research, even though they may not be "statistically significant" at the .05 level. For a complete discussion of statistical problems involved, see the major report of the State Legislative Research Project mentioned above.

7. For a more complete discussion of expertise in the four state legislatures see, William Buchanan, Heinz Eulau, LeRoy C. Ferguson, and John C. Wahlke, "The Legislator as Specialist", The Western Political Quarterly, Vol XIII, No. 3, September, 1960, pp. 636-651.

8. Professor Floyd W. Reeves has suggested that this may be a reflection of the fact that, while California has had relatively large experience in State aid for schools, this financial assistance has been carried out with the retention of a relatively high degree of local administrative autonomy.

9. For a more complete discussion of representational roles see, Heinz Eulau, John C. Wahlke, William Buchanan, and LeRoy C. Ferguson, "The Role of the Representative: Some Empirical Observations on the Theory of Edmund Burke", American Political Science Review, Vol. LIII, No. 3, September, 1959.

10. For a more complete discussion of areal role orientations see ibid.

11. For a more complete discussion of group role orientations see, John C. Wahlke, William Buchanan, Heinz Eulau, and LeRoy C. Ferguson, "American State Legislators' Role Orientations Toward Pressure Groups", The Journal of Politics, Vol. 22, May, 1960.

12. A more complete analysis of the role of parties in the four state legislatures will be presented in a monograph to be published by the Eagleton Foundation in 1961.

13. Tables 27, 28, and 29 were prepared by Professor John C. Wahlke for inclusion in the major report of the State Legislative Research Project mentioned above.

14. In view of the high salience of educational interests shown in Table 27, it should be emphasized that the measure of "general" salience did not include mentions of educational or any other interests in connection with the school needs issue.

15. Op. cit., pp. 21-24.

16. Ibid, p. 22.

17. Corey found that "the most consistent opposition to the education association lobby was given by the Taxpayers Association, while the State Chamber of Commerce was generally rated second". Ibid., p. 23.

18. The specific questions at issue in the seven votes on Assembly Bill 3045 shown in Table 33 were as follows:

> Vote 1. Roll call on Ways and Means amendment which would have provided that Act would become effective only if funds were provided to finance it. p. 3666.
>
> Vote 2. Roll call on Weinberger amendment providing that Act would become effective only if sufficient revenues provided for 90% of financing. p. 3836.
>
> Vote 3. Roll call on reconsideration of adoption of Coolidge amendments which reduced amount of appropriation in bill. p. 3868.
>
> Vote 4. Roll call motion to lay on table motion to set Coolidge amendments as special order. p. 3961.
>
> Vote 5. Roll call on rescinding adoption of Weinberger amendment. p. 4191.
>
> Vote 6. Roll call on Holmes amendments which would permit use of revenue deficiency fund to satisfy conditions of Weinberger amendment. p. 4264.
>
> Vote 7. Roll call on Munnell amendments, which would have reduced financing requirements of Weinberger amendment from 90% to 30%. p. 4275.

The California roll call data were obtained from Richard Wright, who made a tabulation of all roll calls in the California Legislature for the 1957 session. Page references are to the unbound Assembly Journal.

This bill finally passed the Assembly with virtually no opposition, and, while it was altered considerably by Senate amendments, there were no roll call votes in the latter chamber where there was enough opposition to the CTA position to make possible a meaningful analysis of the relation of legislators' attitudes to their voting behavior.

19. Abstentions are not distinguished from absences in the official journal records of the New Jersey Legislature. The data on abstentions in the roll calls shown in Table 34 were recorded by NJEA observers who were in the chamber at the time the vote was taken. The complete voting record on NJEA supported bills in the 1957 session of the New Jersey Legislature is given in the NJEA Review, Vol. 31, No. 1, (September, 1957), pp. 15-16.

20. These voting data were taken from the Ohio House Journal, Vol. 127, pp. 940-41 and p. 1045.

21. The roll call votes shown in Table 36, and a description of the legislative situation in which each vote was recorded were provided by the Tennessee Education Association.

22. Professor Leo A. Haak reports that in an unpublished study of six Michigan communities carried out by the Michigan (Educational) Communications Study, it was found that the better educated people were more likely to have knowledge of what the schools were doing and were more likely to be critical. People with less education were likely to be less well informed about schools and also less critical.

23. The ideology scale consisted of the following three items, each of which called for an agree or disagree response:

a. A man whose loyalty has been questioned before a legislative committee, but who swears under oath that he has never been a communist, should be permitted to teach in our public schools.

b. The government has the responsibility to see to it that all people, poor or rich, have adequate housing, education, medical care, and protection against unemployment.

c. Business enterprise can continue to give us our high standard of living only if it remains free from government regulation.

"Agree" replies to items a. and b., and "disagree" replies to item c. were coded as "liberal" responses. For a complete account of how the scale was constructed, and a discussion of problems in interpreting it, see the major report of the State Legislative Research Project mentioned above.